THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

VOL. CXL, No. 4 APRIL, 1959

CONTENTS

Our Lady and Our Faith ..... *Alfredo Cardinal Ottaviani* 217

The Catholic Student in a Non-Catholic College
Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R. 229

The Priestly Ideal of Saint Bernard .. *Bede Lackner, S.O.Cist.* 237

An Evaluation of Graeco-Russian Theology
John Baptist Terbovich, O.F.M.Cap. 245

The Use of "Ekklesia" in the New Testament. Part I
John L. Murphy 250

The Study of the Ecumenical Council .. *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 260

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS
John P. McCormick, S.S., and Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.

Blessed Theophane Vénard 273

Blessing of Saint Blaise 273

Sign of the Cross after Leonine Prayers 273

Various Rubrics of the Mass 274

Is the Radio Rosary Indulgenced? 275

Bowing at the Doxology 275

The Catholic Stand on Evolution 275

(Contents Continued on Next Page)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1959 by the Catholic University of America Press.

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

Holy Communion to the Sick 276

A Pastor's Power to Confirm 277

A Violation of the Seal 278

BOOK REVIEWS

The Sacrifice of Praise, *by V. G. Little* 279

Insight: A Study of Human Understanding, *by Bernard J. F. Lonergan, S.J.* 279

Christianity and American Freemasonry, *by William J. Whalen* 281

Look Out Below, *by Francis L. Sampson* 283

Saints and Ourselves, *by Philip Caraman, S.J.* 284

Don Bosco, *by Lancelot C. Sheppard* 285

BOOKS RECEIVED 287

Parish Bookkeeping Guide

by

WILLIAM H. SULLIVAN, C.P.A.

and

PETER J. REPETTI, C.P.A.

A "How-To-Do-It" Book Written For Busy Pastors

This is not a text book in the usual sense. Its purpose is to save the time of pastors by supplying clear, concise answers to many bookkeeping problems, and time-tested ways to reduce errors, locate differences, and increase facility and efficiency.

Privately printed in a limited edition, and sold only by direct mail order. Price, $15.00.

Shipments will be made exclusively to priests listed in the 1958 Official Catholic Directory.

Write to:

MUTUAL CONSULTANTS, INC.

11 Park Place, New York 7, N. Y.

In answering advertisements please mention THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

OUR LADY AND OUR FAITH *

St. John the Evangelist concludes his account of the miracle at Cana with this powerful statement: "and his disciples believed in him."[1] It was not, then, at the moment of their calling, but it was at this instant that they began to believe. Their faith was born at Cana.

I would like to call attention to one particular point. When the Blessed Virgin insisted and continued to insist, Our Lord justified His refusal by an appeal to a divine decree, to a disposition of God's providence. He said: "my hour is not yet come."[2] The hour fixed by the Father for His Son's first public miracle, the hour to enkindle the faith in the hearts of the disciples, the hour openly to manifest the new era of the new kingdom and of the new epoch, the age, if one may so speak, of the eternal in time, and of the divine in the human: that hour is not yet come. Up until now it is only in secret and within an intimate circle that there has been an awareness of this new era of history, within which the Word is made flesh. Thus it was through Mary that the first triumphs of the faith, of that faith by which man becomes a child of God, were obtained.

There was, then, an hour fixed by the eternal design. But God has willed that this hour should be anticipated through Mary's intervention.

My brothers, this influence of Mary's prayer on the divine omnipotence does not astonish us. Has not her own Jesus placed the summit of all the greatness a human creature can possess within the depths of Mary's humility?

These considerations show us as much. It was not by chance that Mary, who gave Jesus to men, was present, and so effectively present, at Cana that day. Neither was it by chance that she was present on that first Pentecost. This humble woman, the humblest of all women, gave Jesus to us. She continues to give Him to us

* This is the translation of the paper delivered at Lourdes, during the Marian Congress last September, by the Cardinal Pro-Secretary of the Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office.

[1] *John*, 2:11.
[2] *John*, 2:4.

throughout the course of history. For she is, in a certain way, the image, the type, the symbol, and the model of the Church. For the Church itself is both Virgin and Mother, and it engenders Jesus in the hearts of men. One may find again in the history of the Church that which took place in the earthly life of Jesus. Mary has been palpably and visibly present during the faith's darkest and most painful hours, as she has always been the bright dawn of the days of the faith's greatest triumphs.

Mary does not cease to be present and effective in that continued Pentecost which is the spiritual government of souls and the work of the *magisterium*. I can assure you, my dear brothers, that this presence of Mary is especially manifest in Rome, in that august Rome which finds its glory in the humble service of the entire world, in that Rome which lives for its brother men, and which knows no other mission, no other salvation, than to be "ordained for men."[3]

Since the very beginning of my priestly life, all my life has been spent in the humble service of this central and universal government of the Church. Thus I can bear witness that Our Lady's presence gives us the assurance that we are working in the Church and for the Church with Jesus Christ.

It is by reason of this presence of Mary that, over the course of the centuries, Rome has frequently attributed to her and to her all-powerful intercession, the victories, the glories, and the triumphs that the Church has obtained. For she is formidable as an army arrayed for battle.[4] And, along with Rome, the entire Church has taken pleasure in depicting the crown that St. John saw on her brow. For he witnessed "on her head a crown of twelve stars."[5]

Permit me to mention, briefly and in passing, some few of these glorious interventions of Mary in the life of the Church. I am speaking to Christians who are aware of the steps the Church has taken in its passage across the world, steps which were so many stations of a sorrowful way of the cross. They know how Jesus passed His life in this world, and they are aware of His life in the secret of their hearts. They have learned how He has lived over the course of the centuries in His Church.

[3] Cf. *Heb.*, 5:1.
[4] Cf. *Cant.*, 6:3, 9.
[5] *Apoc.*, 12:1.

THE PAGAN WORLD

How could the pagan world, corrupted as it was by idolatry and cruelty, ever come to accept chastity, purity, and virginity? Consider, my friends, what the influence of Mary's virginal motherhood was in a matter of such importance.

From the point of view of paganism, for which Our Lord's cross was something foolish, this virginal motherhood was the object of contemptuous mockery. In the fight against Christianity, the hatred of the pagans associated Mary with Our Lord in its attacks. But, on the other hand, the first Christian apologists associated the splendors of Mary's grace with the splendors of Our Lord's divinity. The first triumphs of Christian truth were obtained through the brilliance of those two glorious names. Thus Our Lord manifested Mary, and she manifested Him.

From the early days of the Church, the literature of Judaism joined in this conflict. Mary was made the object of odious calumnies. The mother was attacked in an attempt to hurt the Son.

On the other side there were certain gnostics who, while retaining the title of "Son of Mary" for Our Lord, denied any importance to the Redemption because they took all real meaning away from the Incarnation. In their teaching, there was nothing left of the divine motherhood but an empty image. On this point Marcion was destined to have a successor in Nestorius, who drew out all the implications latent in the principles advanced by Marcion.

In the midst of these great struggles, Mary's intervention for the defense of the Church found its first witness and its first herald in the person of the beloved disciple. It was he who wrote in his Gospel: "the disciple took her to his own."[6] This apostle, who like a mighty eagle soars into the heights of the divinity, has set down in his books the last words of the written revelation. He tells us of the first appearance of Mary after her Assumption and tells us also of her coronation in heaven.

Yes, the first apparition of Our Lady was attested and described by this apostle, who was the first to be able to call Mary his mother by reason of the explicit direction given by Jesus Himself, a direction addressed to all of us in the person of St. John.

[6] *John*, 19:27.

In that vision, how did this disciple, beloved by Jesus, and thus beloved also by Mary, see the Blessed Virgin? He had lived with her day after day, and hour after hour, up until her last moment. He knew her face as well as he knew that of his own mother.

Let us hear his inspired words: "And a great sign appeared in heaven: a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and on her head a crown of twelve stars."[7]

This vision terminates in the symbolic description of the marvelous victory which the Church, typified by Mary, gained over the infernal dragon. Certainly John explained that vision to Polycarp, his disciple, who became bishop of Smyrna. It is highly probable that Irenaeus, who came from Smyrna, received that teaching from Polycarp himself. And so it is in no way astonishing that Irenaeus was, along with Justin his contemporary, the first doctor to teach the victorious mission of the New Eve in the Church of Christ.

Irenaeus, after his visit to the disciples of the apostles in Asia, brought that Marian message to Lyons, and thus to all France, and thus again to the entire world. It is a message that inspires our confidence. It is a pledge of salvation and a promise of victory.

Irenaeus wrote that Eve, seduced by the word of the angel, abandoned God and was unfaithful to His command. Mary received the angel's word and received God in herself. The first disobeyed God. The second obeyed Him. The human race, ruined through a virgin, was saved through a virgin.[8]

That message was identical with the one preached by Justin in Rome. God's faithful heard it in the recesses of the catacombs. And it was in the catacombs that, for the first time, there was proposed for the veneration of Christians an image of Mary associated with her divine Son.**

How many martyrs must have looked at that picture and have been filled with confidence before they left for the Coliseum to gain their glorious crowns. This fresco still exists today, to attest for our time and for the days to come the faith and the confidence in Mary that characterized those heroes of the early Christian genera-

[7] *Apoc.*, 12: 1.

[8] Cf. St. Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses*, V, 19, 1.

** Editor's note. The image to which Cardinal Ottaviani refers is that described in the article "Our Lady Queen of Prophets," published in *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, CXXIV, 5 (May, 1951), 381-86.

tions. Their blood was the seed of the victories that Christians of later days were destined to gain over persecutors and heretics.

It was in that same spirit that there was prepared, at the Council of Ephesus, that solemn rejoicing among the people, who in a sea of lighted torches, marked the triumph of the truth in the name of Mary, the Mother of God.

At Ephesus, one of the most pernicious of all the heresies was crushed in the name of Mary and of her divine maternity.

THE AGE OF THE BARBARIANS

Not long afterwards violence, which is as it were incarnate in a barbarian world, made the Church pass through long centuries of painful sorrow. There was a long iron age. Everything was smashed. Everything was overthrown. Everything was dark and somber. Yet Christian Rome conquered its barbarian conquerors.

Horace sang of Athens' victory over its Roman conqueror: "Greece, itself captured, in its turn captured the rough conqueror and brought the arts to rude Latium."[9] How much more beautiful, and how much more profitable for the world, was the triumph of Christian Rome over its conquerors, the barbarians!

What was Mary's place in this stage of history? Let us look to the arts, to poetry, to theology, and to the liturgy, for the answer to this question. They all give testimony to Mary's influence in favor of that glorious victory of Christian light over the darkness of the period. As a matter of fact, one of the most powerfully effective factors in that triumph of the spirit over brute force was certainly to be found in the way that these rough men were attracted to the Blessed Virgin because of the splendor of her grace and of her virtues, by reason of her maternal tenderness, and of her lovely superhuman beauty.

To these barbaric people who had lowered woman to a subhuman level, Mary's spiritual and supernatural glory came like a bright ray of light, powerful enough to penetrate the most profound darkness.

The mighty force of the grace of Christ, obtained through Mary's intercession and spread abroad by reason of her gentle attractiveness, was destined to be poured out abundantly along the furrows

[9] *Epodes,* II, 1.

traced by the barbarian invasions, and the peoples of the earth have good cause to be grateful that it has been so.

Hardly had Europe begun to lay the foundations of the Christian order when there arose everywhere those magnificent temples which were destined to proclaim the glories of Mary throughout the ages to come.

The very people who, in Rome, destroyed the pagan temple of Minerva built it up again with their own hands to consecrate it to Mary the Queen of Martyrs. It is the Church *Sancta Maria supra Minervam.*

Devotion to Mary gave nobility to these neophytes. The warlike taste of these rude and strong people was turned, with the crusades, towards a pursuit of a victory for Christianity over the Moslem armies. And, when they first saw Jerusalem, the victorious crusaders intoned the *Salve Regina.*

In this same era Mary gave a great victory to the Church through the action of her faithful servant, that heroic pastor, St. Gregory VII. This great Pope was destined to have the glory of freeing the Church from the bonds placed upon it by those who, little by little, had taken it captive. He was not content to build the strong structure of law upon the divine foundations of the Church, but he also delivered the Spouse of Christ from the clutches of Caesar. Likewise he brought the clergy back to purity and to poverty, and restored the monks to fidelity to Rome. He made princes conscious of the fact that they were Christians like other men, and that they ought to be even more Christian than the rest. He organized the first network of representatives from Rome to protect the religious independence of the faithful, of the clergy, and of the Church, in various countries. His letters bring out the fact that he resembled both Caesar and Augustine. But, above all, they show his devotion to the Blessed Virgin. His biographers depict him kneeling before one of the most popular Roman representations of the Blessed Virgin, praying as an humble member of the Church. This admirable genius opened the second millennium of Christian history in the name of Mary, and in the name of the Roman Church.

THE MARIAN MIDDLE AGES

The heresies of this new period were no longer directed against the dogma of the Blessed Trinity. Moreover, this was not the era

of the great schisms. The new errors had reference to the mystical life and to the ecclesiastical life. They were the acrimonious heresies which led the way towards Protestantism, and which found their fulfillment in Protestantism.

Against these heresies there arose devotions that were new, not in their substance, but in their modality. First of all, in the twelfth century, there came the devotion to the humanity of Christ. Then, in the thirteenth century, there appeared the great devotion to the Eucharist, and finally, in the fourteenth, the devotion to Our Lord's Passion. All these three devotions contributed new splendor to the devotion to Our Lady. The *Stabat Mater* belongs to this period.

In the fight for the triumph of the Church and of truth, Mary gave encouragement to the people devoted to her. Mary's name gave the impulse for great projects. In Mary's name and under her tutelage there arose many religious orders that were to constitute the new spiritual armies of the Church against the heresies and for the cause of peace among Christians.

The glory of Mary shines forth at the very summit of Dante's *Divine Comedy,* and it is manifest in the songs of many poets of the age, just as it appears in the cathedrals of Italy, Spain, England, France, and Germany. Notre Dame of Paris, and Notre Dame of Chartres, and so many other sanctuaries have come down through the centuries as symbols of inward peace and as asylums of spiritual repose in the midst of life's struggles and difficulties. Even in our own day, the man who is looking for the best in the youth of France will find it in pilgrimage on the road that leads from Paris to Chartres.

Because of Mary's influence, the anarchical movements that prated about poverty and that stirred up revolt did not succeed in overthrowing the discipline of the Church. New nationalisms could dominate a great part of the clergy and could incite the great schism of the west. They did not prevail over Rome. They might divide Christians. They might tear away from the Church a great part of Germany and of England. But they were unable to rob the Church of its vigor, its honor, and its unity. The Catholics remained faithful to the Church in remaining faithful to Mary, their Mother. For she is the one who kept her devout children within the embrace of their Mother, the Church.

THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

It is an unchanging law: wherever the devotion to the Mother is retained, the Son has remained present with her, and His vicar has continued to be the guarantee of the unity of His Mystical Body. Protestantism left no place for Mary. For, in repudiating the altar of the Son, it repudiated the shrine of the Mother at the same time. In refusing obedience to the Vicar of Jesus Christ, the Protestants have scattered like sheep who fail to hear the voice of the shepherd. In vain will they struggle to find unity again apart from Jesus present in the Eucharist, and apart from Our Lady and the Pope.

After Protestantism had denied the Church and Mary, it was condemned by the decrees of the Council of Trent. Mary Immaculate was definitely involved in the success of this great Council, to which she owed the first authoritative testimony given by the Church to her exemption from the stain of original sin.[10]

While Protestantism was unleashing its attacks against the Church, the Turks were unceasingly renewing their attempts to invade Europe. The battle of Lepanto was waged against them, and that battle was the triumph and the victory of the Rosary. This was the successful effect of the first Marian Congress, for that name has been given to the great number of combatants who, grouped together on their ships, praised Mary together and invoked her help, by means of the Rosary, before the issue of battle was decided.

These triumphs of Mary were destined to be repeated at Budapest and at Vienna during the course of the seventeenth century.

THE EIGHTEENTH AND NINETEENTH CENTURIES

More recently we have lived through eras, not only of heresy, but of public unbelief such as the world has not known since the coming of Jesus Christ. This unbelief has brought to our countries a neo-paganism which is all the more serious in that it involves a rejection of the faith by renegades and apostates. Alas, the enemy

[10] Declarat tamen haec ipsa Synodus, non esse suae intentionis, comprehendere in hoc decreto, ubi de peccato originali agitur, beatam et immaculatam Virginem Mariam Dei genitricem, sed observandas esse constitutiones felicis recordationis Sixti Papae IV, sub poenis in eis constitutionibus contentis, quas innovat. *Denz.*, 792.

who made his strongest bid at Lepanto, at Budapest, and at Vienna, and whose efforts were foiled by Mary, has been succeeded by a foe of a different kind. The empire of this new enemy is greater than any that ever existed before. His power is on a level with his ferocity. His capacity to harm is equal to his ability to resist.

Must we then refuse to hope in her whom we hail as the "Help of Christians"?

Did the Church despair when the ridiculous "Goddess of Reason" was placed on the altar of Notre Dame, in the position consecrated to the invincible Queen of heaven and of earth? It did not! The Christians placed their confidence in the Virgin of Perpetual Help, and they prayed to her. Pope Pius VII put his confidence in her, and he confirmed that confidence by a solemn vow which he made in Savona. The entire Church called upon her, and the voice of the Spouse of Christ rose up to her. And Mary came down from heaven to give aid. In Paris Catherine Labouré received from the hands of the Blessed Virgin the pledge of abundant graces that were ready to come down upon the earth. At Lourdes Bernadette Soubirous saw Mary Immaculate. At Mary's command she uncovered the spring, the symbol of the graces and the miracles which are so many triumphant manifestations of her power, not only over physical evil, but even more over unbelief, over the scepticism and the pride of the wise men of this world who have become infatuated by their own false science.

MARY'S PRESENCE IN OUR OWN TIMES

Today also Mary is present in the Church. She is present here as she was present at the marriage feast of Cana. Pope Pius XII called out to her in his proclamation of the dogma of the Assumption. The faithful call to her by their numberless devotions. Again the theologians call to her in this renewal of Marian theology which has never before been equalled, even in the eighteenth century. During the course of the second millennium of the Church's history, apparitions of the Blessed Virgin have covered the Catholic lands with a number of Marian sanctuaries, rich in miracles and frequented by throngs of pilgrims. This Lourdes is a capital of prayer and of grace.

Without any doubt, the Blessed Virgin is present here among us, to defend us against the enemies of Christian civilization. Modern

society is stricken with a terrible fever for novelty. It is also infested with men who want to take advantage of our sufferings to impose the weight of their tyranny upon us, to set up among us a den for their own immoralities and their own injustices. Evil assumes immense proportions and takes on an apocalyptic character. Humanity has never known such danger before. From hour to hour we are in a position to lose, not only our lives, but all our civilization and all our hope. We can lose both the present and the future. The atomic bomb itself cannot produce a desert as atrocious as that which can result from the predominant teaching of a godless society. The new weapons can crush our bodies, but how completely the new teachings strive to break our souls. This is all the more true since strange and dangerous erroneous tendencies from our own side have been joined to the aberrations of a profane science that denies God.

Today, as in the times of the great heresies, there flourishes a science of the half-scholarly who use doctrine to flatter their own vanity, and who are strangers to the reverential fear which necessarily accompanies the Wisdom of the sacred disciplines. I speak of the pretended science of the half-scholarly: for rarely do real scholars, great scholars, oppose the supreme *magisterium* of the Church. This easy science of the half-scholars strives to reduce eternity to time, the supernatural to nature, grace to human effort, and God to man.

If Mary does not come back among us, how shall we avoid fearing the consequences of such errors and such horrors?

What will become of us? From whom shall we hope for salvation? Certainly we shall not expect it from human powers. The experience of each day points out far too clearly the truth of the divine warning: "Put not your trust in princes: in the children of men, in whom there is no salvation."[11] The incapacity of human powers is clearly manifest. Forty years ago a stain of red blood spilled by tyranny began to place the burden of the most intolerable oppression on men and their minds, on individuals and on nations. And, despite the efforts made by statesmen to hold that oppression in check, it has never stopped growing and today it threatens all that is left of freedom and of human dignity in the entire world. The Lord Himself seems

[11] *Psalm* 145:2 f.

deaf to our voice. One might say that He simulates that sleep that called forth the Prophet's prayer: "Arise, O Lord, why sleepest thou?"[12] and which wrung that cry of desolation from the disciples when the bark was menaced by the storm.[13]

The Lord seems to say to us also: "My hour is not yet come."[14] But the Immaculate Mother of God, the image and the protectress of the Church, has shown us at Cana that she knows how to obtain and can obtain, as it were, an anticipation of the divine hour.

It is imperative for us that this hour come quickly. It is imperative that it should be anticipated. It must come immediately. For we dare to say: "Mother, we, thy children, can do nothing more."

Have confidence. Lourdes has given us the assurance of Mary's victorious presence. Because of our sins we deserve these cruel massacres, these pitiless executions. We have driven her Son from our schools and our factories, from our fields and from our villages, from our streets and from our homes. We have driven him from the hearts of so many men. Our generation has taken up again the cry: "We will not have this man to reign over us."[15] Given a choice between Barabbas and Jesus, we have chosen Barabbas. As between the Master of the universe and a malefactor, we have preferred the malefactor.

But no hour is closer to the hour of the resurrection than that of the crucifixion. It is true that Barabbas has triumphed, and that he sits upon his throne. Jesus is nailed to the cross, in the flesh of so many martyrs, of so many victims of torture, and of so many of those who have been driven from their homes, and in the souls of so many of the oppressed and the tormented. Never before have so many of the crosses of the Christians been raised up in the huge and cruel garden of Nero, which the entire world has become.

Mary, Mother of love and of sorrow, Mother of Bethlehem and of Calvary, intercede for us, and hasten the divine hour.

May Mary say the necessary word as she did at Cana. May she speak with the same power of intercession. If Jesus hesitates, if He should refuse, may she triumph over those hesitations, as, by her maternal piety, she has triumphed over our unworthiness.

[12] *Psalm* 43:23.
[13] Cf. *Matt.*, 14:24-32; *Mark*, 6:46-51; *John*, 6:17-21.
[14] *John*, 2:4. [15] *Luke*, 19:14.

May she be for us a Mother endowed with pity, and for Him, a Mother endowed with authority. May she deign to hasten her hour, which is our hour.

O Mary, we can do no more. The human race is going to perish unless you intervene in its behalf.

Speak for us, O Virgin of Silence. Speak for us, O Mary.

ALFREDO CARDINAL OTTAVIANI

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for April, 1909, contributed by Fr. A. Avignon, O.S.B., of Ramsgate, England, is entitled "The Time of the Crucifixion." The author endeavors, from the scriptural narratives of Our Lord's last mortal hours, to compute as nearly as possible the time when the principal events occurred on the first Good Friday. He believes that Pilate sentenced Christ to death about 11 A.M., and that His body was taken down from the cross about 5 P.M. . . . Dr. James J. Walsh writes on "The Physiological Psychology of Scruples." He states that as a rule people are much more troubled by scruples in the morning than in the evening. He recommends the use of bromides in some cases as a means of soothing the scrupulous. . . . An anonymous article explains the rules to be followed by members of religious orders in collecting funds. It is based on a recent decree of the Sacred Congregation of Bishops and Regulars. . . . This issue contains three more chapters of Canon Sheehan's novel "The Blindness of the Reverend Dr. Gray." . . . Fr. J. Fryar, writing from England, in an interesting article entitled "Easter" describes some of the old English customs connected with this feast, such as the preparation of Easter cakes and Easter eggs. . . . In the Analecta we find the decree of the Holy See establishing the diocese of Rockford in Illinois. . . . In the Studies and Conferences the question of liturgy in the vernacular is discussed at some length by several correspondents. . . . Fr. Slater, S.J., takes exception to some of the statements of Dr. John A. Ryan in his article on stockwatering, which appeared in the February issue. . . . Fr. F. Brossart, of Covington, Ky., discusses the canonical legislation regarding the right to choose one's own place of burial. . . . A correspondent informs us that Fridays of Advent, though days of fast as well as of abstinence by the general law of the Church, are not observed as fast days in certain parts of the United States. He is uncertain whether they have been abrogated by custom, by dispensation or by diversity of legislation.

F.J.C.

THE CATHOLIC STUDENT IN A NON-CATHOLIC COLLEGE

It will doubtless cause surprise to many of my readers to be told that more than sixty percent of the Catholic students in colleges and universities in the United States are attending non-Catholic institutions. In round numbers, there are now about 400,000 Catholic men and women enrolled in non-Catholic colleges and universities. These statistics are a reasonable deduction from a survey conducted in 1953, which stated that then there were 320,000 Catholics attending secular universities and colleges—almost twice as many as were enrolled in Catholic institutions of higher learning.[1] And, as the years pass, we must expect to see an even greater proportion of our Catholic youth applying for admission to colleges and universities that are not under the jurisdiction of the Catholic Church—either those that are non-sectarian, like the State universities, or those that (nominally, at least) are conducted under the auspices of some non-Catholic denomination. For, the resources of the Catholics in our land are not sufficient to keep up with the rapid increase in the number of those who will seek an education beyond the secondary level within the next two decades—at least if we accept the predictions of those who have attempted to estimate the growth of higher education in the years to come.

Priests should be prepared to explain to students or prospective students at non-Catholic colleges and universities and to their parents the principles of Catholic teaching pertinent to this situation. It is strange and even alarming to find many Catholics who are unaware of even the fundamental moral problems connected with the question of a Catholic student in a non-Catholic educational institution. It is the purpose of this article to enunciate and to explain the principles on this matter which should be known to Catholics, especially to young persons planning to seek admission to a non-Catholic college and to their parents.

First, education in a non-Catholic institution cannot be regarded as the ideal type of training for a Catholic. For education should include religious instruction and guidance, whether it be in elemen-

[1] *Newman Club Manual* (Washington, D. C., 1954), pp. 8 f.

tary or secondary schools, in colleges or universities. And by religious instruction and guidance we mean instruction in Catholic doctrine and training in the practice of the Catholic faith.

Some might reply that this condition is fulfilled in those colleges where a Newman club or a Catholic center has been established under the direction of a Catholic priest. But such an assertion is erroneous. It is true, there are about 750 non-Catholic colleges in our country that have Newman clubs or similar organizations for the spiritual benefit of the Catholic students; and the priests in charge of these establishments are capable and zealous men. I believe also that some of those Catholics who have completed the course in such colleges aided by active participation in the Newman club are now superior in their religious practices to many graduates of Catholic institutions of higher learning. But it does not represent the Catholic ideal of education to have religious training as a mere accessory, supplied entirely from some extrinsic source. Religious instruction and guidance should permeate the whole curriculum, in order that the education may be Catholic in the true sense. This principle was expressed thus by Pope Pius XI in his Encyclical on Christian education:

> For, because the instruction in religion is given in a certain school (usually too sparingly), such a school for this reason does not satisfy the rights of the Church and family; nor is it thus made suitable for the attendance of Catholic pupils; for, in order that any school measure up this, it is quite necessary that all instruction and doctrine, the whole organization of the school, namely, its teachers, plan of studies, books, in fact, whatever pertains to any branch of learning, be so permeated and be so strong in Christian spirit, under the guidance and the eternal vigilance of the Church, that religion itself forms both the basis and the end of the entire scheme of instruction; and this, not only in the schools in which the elements of learning are taught but also in those of higher studies.[2]

Furthermore, even the most successful Newman clubs do not succeed in affiliating all the Catholic students in a non-Catholic college. Indeed, as far as my own investigations go, in most non-Catholic colleges the great majority of the Catholic students take little or no part in the activities of any Catholic establishment on the campus.

[2] *AAS*, XXII (1930), 77.

Secondly, it is *per se* illicit for a Catholic to attend a non-Catholic college or university—that is, it is forbidden by Church law, unless there is a good reason for doing so, approved by the local Ordinary. For, the Code has this prohibition:

> Catholic youth shall not attend schools that are non-Catholic, neutral or mixed—namely, those that are open also to non-Catholics. It belongs only to the local Ordinary to determine, in accordance with the instructions of the Apostolic See, in what circumstances and with what safeguards for the avoidance of the danger of perversion, it can be tolerated that these schools may be attended.[3]

Some commentators on the Code believe that this prohibition extends only to the attendance of Catholic youth at elementary and high schools, particularly because the word which we translate as "youth" is *pueri*.[4] However, an excellent (and it seems to me, convincing) argument that this canon extends to college and university students also is given by Rev. A. Sokolich in his doctoral dissertation *Canonical Provisions for Universities and Colleges*.[5] At any rate, the *divine* law certainly forbids *per se* the attendance of many young men and women at non-Catholic colleges and universities, because such institutions are to them dangerous occasions of sin. In the words of Bouscaren-Ellis (who hold the more lenient view regarding the extent of the canonical prohibition): "The natural law itself forbids Catholics to attend schools, whatever their grade, if they are dangerous to faith or morals. Both common experience and many documents of the Holy See prove that this danger may well exist not only in the elementary and high school, but in college and university as well."[6]

In view of these facts, it is surprising to read in an editorial appearing in *Ave Maria* for January 3, 1959, the statement that "by careful investigation parents can assure themselves and their children that enrollment in a non-Catholic college will not mean loss of the Faith." It is difficult to see how parents and children can have any assurance that enrollment in a non-Catholic college will not mean loss of the Faith. It is true, we cannot say that a Catholic student

[3] Canon 1374.

[4] E.g., Bouscaren-Ellis, *Canon Law* (Milwaukee, 1951), p. 763.

[5] A. Sokolich, *Canonical Provisions for Universities and Colleges* (Catholic University of America Press, 1956), pp. 67-78.

[6] Bouscaren-Ellis, *op. cit.*, p. 762.

in such an institution is sure to lose the Faith, but to say that there can be assurance that he will not lose this precious gift is a statement that cannot be upheld in reference to any non-Catholic college in our land at the present day.

Accordingly, we can say that *per se* it is forbidden to Catholic students to attend non-Catholic colleges and universities. But what is *per se* wrong can sometimes *per accidens* become lawful—namely, when there are grave reasons for performing this act, and safeguards are taken to prevent spiritual harm. This can be the case with the attendance of Catholic students at non-Catholic institutions of higher learning. But before we can make particular applications to the question we are discussing, we must distinguish different types of non-Catholic colleges. A college designated as non-Catholic may be under the authority of a particular non-Catholic religious group; or it may be entirely secular, committed to no form of religion.

It is difficult to see how a Catholic can ever be allowed to enroll in a school or college that is distinctively sectarian, at least when non-Catholic religious instruction and practice are enjoined on all the students—for example, when all are obliged to take a course in some form of non-Catholic religious doctrine or to attend chapel services regularly. Of course, absolutely speaking, the Catholic student might have enough knowledge of his faith to perceive the errors in the instruction and he might attend the services in a purely passive way. But the average student would not have the ability or the courage to avoid sin in this way; and in addition there is great danger that he would give scandal to others. Accordingly, it must surely be accepted as a general rule that the attendance of a Catholic at such a college is forbidden, no matter what reasons may be alleged in justification.[7]

A more lenient judgment can be made when there is question of a religiously neutral college, one that is entirely indifferent to every creed. In the same category could be placed a college that is only nominally religious—connected with some religious denominations, but imposing no obligations of a religious nature on the students.

[7] This principle is still more important when it is concerned with the attendance of Catholic boys and girls at high schools and academies in which non-Catholic religious instruction and non-Catholic religious services are obligatory for all the pupils. Yet, there are many Catholic parents who send their sons and daughters to such schools.

But it must be remembered that even in the case of such colleges a serious reason is required before a Catholic may enroll as a student. The Code, in Canon 1374, indicates that such reasons can exist. One of these justifying causes has already been mentioned, the fact that our Catholic colleges cannot accommodate all the Catholic young men and women who seek admission. Others can be the fact that a particular course of study which the student desires is not available in a Catholic institution, such as a course of a highly technical nature,[8] and also the limited finances of the student and of his parents. Other reasons might be the fact that a young man's non-Catholic father insists that his son attend his own Alma Mater, and perhaps the fact that a youth has won a scholarship at a non-Catholic college. But such reasons may not be interpreted too broadly. Above all, it must be emphasized that the social prestige that a non-Catholic college may offer and the opportunity of getting into the "best" circles are not adequate reasons for renouncing the advantages of a Catholic education for one that is purely secular and perhaps even irreligious.[9]

In recent times we have heard from Catholic sources complaints that there are serious academic deficiencies in Catholic educational institutions of higher learning. Now, I believe that the standards of education generally prevailing in schools and colleges in the United States can stand an improvement, but I cannot see why complaints should be directed exclusively against Catholic institutions in such wise as to give the impression that notably higher standards are maintained in non-Catholic colleges and universities. Perhaps this may be true in the sphere of specialized physical science, since Catholic educational institutions are hampered by lack of funds. But in reference to general educational standards, the remarks recently made by Archbishop Meyer of Chicago and by Bishop Gorman of Dallas-Fort Worth should be brought to the attention of Catholics contemplating a college course and of their parents, who may be inclined to choose a non-Catholic institution on the ground that it will assure a much better education. These distinguished

[8] This is the one reason adduced by the Third Council of Baltimore as justifying parents in sending their children to a non-Catholic educational institution (*Acta et Decreta*, n. 210).

[9] Pope Pius XI asserted of supposedly neutral schools: "They cannot long remain neutral, since as a matter of fact they soon became irreligious" (*AAS*, XXII, [1930], 76).

prelates assert that the complaints of Catholic educators are greatly exaggerated, or have been taken out of context by news writers. Bishop Gorman has definitely stated that if compared department for department with secular colleges, many Catholic colleges will be found to match the best in the United States.[10]

Third, Catholics attending a non-Catholic college or university, even though there may be a justifying reason for such attendance, have the obligation to continue the study of Catholic doctrine. It can safely be asserted that no Catholic is sufficiently equipped with knowledge of the faith when he enters such an institution to protect him from spiritual harm, no matter how thorough may have been his previous course in religion. This obligation also affects the parents of students, in that they must see that their son or daughter is provided with regular instruction in Catholic teaching. Ordinarily this means that the young person must join the Newman club, or other Catholic establishment, and attend the meetings regularly. It means also that the priest in charge of this Catholic group must frequently give religious instructions—or at least provide that they be given by others—in accordance with the needs of the students. If some religious problem is being debated on the campus, he must see that the Catholic teaching on the subject is adequately proposed to the students. Of course, he should also be interested in the religious practices of the students, especially their regular reception of the sacraments. In the case of a day student, this obligation falls mainly on the young person's pastor, as well as on his parents. In this connection it should be noted that a Catholic student may not read books forbidden by the Church, even though they are prescribed by a professor, without ecclesiastical permission.

There is far greater spiritual danger to Catholic students who live on the campus of a non-Catholic college than to those who live in a good Catholic home. For the strong influence of the paganism that saturates many of the secular educational institutions of our country as well as the indubitable fact that in many of them the moral tone is deplorably low furnish grave peril to the faith and the morals of those who reside habitually in the precincts of the college.

Fourth, as was previously stated, Canon 1374 asserts that the decision whether or not a Catholic may attend a non-Catholic school

[10] NCWC News Release, February 2 and 6, 1959.

belongs to the local Ordinary; and it would seem that this applies to colleges as well as to elementary and high schools. At any rate, the local Ordinary has the authority to forbid a student under his jurisdiction to attend a non-Catholic institution of higher learning or to lay down the conditions on which such attendance will depend. The proper Ordinary of the student is the Ordinary of his place of domicile or quasi-domicile, so that in the event that a student's regular home is in another diocese but he resides at the college, he is subject to the Ordinary of the diocese in which the college is situated, as well as to the Ordinary of the diocese where he has his home. Even if he is only a day student, commuting every day from another diocese, it would seem that the Ordinary of the place where the college is situated may lay down rules and conditions for his attendance at the college, since this is a matter pertaining to public order.[11]

Most of our bishops tacitly tolerate the attendance of Catholics at secular colleges and universities, in the sense that they issue no prohibitions or conditions to students entering such colleges and universities.[12] Indeed, it would be impossible for a bishop to review every case of this kind, at least in a large diocese.[13] But our bishops certainly expect their priests to exercise an earnest pastoral care for students attending or planning to attend non-Catholic schools or colleges. I do not believe it would be too much to expect a pastor or his assistant to visit the parents of every boy or girl contemplating enrollment in a non-Catholic college or university to discuss the matter courteously and kindly, and above all, to discover whether or not there is sufficient reason for this procedure. I believe that at times the priest will be able to persuade the parents to send the young person to a Catholic educational institution. At any rate, he can and should always try to gain the assurance that the best safeguards available will be used to protect the faith and the morals of the boy or girl who is going to meet conditions that can prove very disastrous to his or her spiritual welfare and eternal salvation.

[11] A. Sokolich, *op. cit.*, pp. 98-104.

[12] I have heard of one bishop who will grant permission to a Catholic youth to attend a non-Catholic college or university only on condition that he will become an active member of the Newman club.

[13] For example, a recent report recorded 5,563 Catholic students enrolled in 18 non-Catholic colleges and graduate schools in the diocese of Albany (NCWC News Report, Feb. 5, 1959).

Fifth, our young folk attending non-Catholic colleges should regard it as a duty to protest when false statements or derogatory comments regarding Catholic faith or practices are made in the classroom. This does not necessarily mean that a Catholic is bound to create a scene when a remark of this kind is made. It may be that if he makes an immediate protest he will find himself unable to substantiate it logically and correctly. But he should be instructed to impress on his memory the statement exactly as it was made, to prepare himself to refute it or to explain in what way it was false, and then courteously and clearly (usually in private) to make his protest to the person who uttered it. It is pathetic when, after an erroneous and disparaging remark about things Catholic is made in the classroom of an institution committed to the quest of truth, the Catholic students lack the courage or the interest or the intellectual ability to do something about it. Our Jewish fellow citizens can set us an example in this matter.

It is regrettable that there are not enough Catholic institutions of higher learning in our land to accommodate all the Catholic youth desirous of a college or university training. But we are far from this ideal, and we must accept the situation realistically. In view of the great numbers of our young folk who are being subjected, or will be subjected in the near future, to dangers to faith and morals on the campuses and in the classrooms of many American schools and colleges and universities, it behooves every priest devoted to the care of souls to do all in his power to protect these young people from the perils that surround them.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.
The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

THE PRIESTLY IDEAL OF SAINT BERNARD

It is strange: St. Bernard entered a contemplative order, and, notwithstanding, he became one of the most active priests of the Church. He dedicated his life entirely to God and yet, in the interest of men's salvation, he constantly ministered to souls. He went to the monastery for the purpose of burying himself in God's solitude, and God, nevertheless, delivered him over to men. His life was a continuous stream between God's presence in the monastery, and the fallen world. His heart burned with love for both, and this polar strength constituted the wondrous synthesis of his priestly life.[1]

It is therefore understandable that his priestly ideal comprises the single word *mediator*. Yes, the priest stands at the boundary post of two worlds; he is the bridge and the bridgebuilder in one person. He unites infinite sanctity with boundless misery. "This bridge extends all the way to God, for it labors not for its own glory but for His; and it extends to men, for it desires not its own advantage but that of its fellow-creatures. As true mediator, he offers to God the prayers and sacrifices of the people, and receives from God blessings and graces in exchange. . . . He is a faithful mediator, for everything that passes through his hands he regards with the simple eyes of the dove; he keeps nothing for himself, be it the gifts of God to men or the gifts they bring to Him. He seeks not the gifts but the salvation of men, neither does he rob the honor of God."[2]

He who desires to lead souls to God, must himself, first of all, live in Him and with Him. This is the characteristic feature of his priestly ideal: the power derived from the ordination, the conviction of his mission, his love for the people, his knowledge and experience —all these are not sufficient; he must, before all else, be the man of God; that means, he must always look inwards. The priestly vocation is therefore a call to the interior, to the inner paradise of the soul.

The first step upon this road is the break with the world. How else then could the priest, the constant evangelist from the other

[1] Cf. also our article in *Anima*, a Swiss pastoral quarterly: "Ueber das Priesterideal des heiligen Bernhard," *Anima*, VIII (1953), 5-12.

[2] "De moribus et officio episcoporum tractatus seu epistola XLII ad Henricum Archiepiscopum Senonensem," *MPL*, 182, cols. 817-818.

world, belong to that world whose prince is Satan? "You who are the priest of the Most High, whom do you wish to please: the world or God? If the world, then why are you a priest? If God, why are you like the children of the world? You cannot serve two masters at the same time! . . . If you aim to please men, then you no longer please God; if you are not pleasing to Him, then likewise your prayer of atonement is not pleasing either. And what then is the sense of being a priest?"[3]

After the soul has renounced the world, then can it begin the way to the inner life. This path leads through three stages: *Purity,* according to the teaching of St. Bernard, springs from the essence of the priesthood. In the history of salvation, angels are the intermediaries of God. If the priest takes upon himself this way of life and also desires to lead men to God, then he, too, must lead an angelic life. He who wishes to lead men to God must even now become a heavenly being, and if he intends to bear God in his earthy life, he can do that only in a holy and pure vessel. "Purity preserves for sanctity the fragile vessel that we carry with us, our body, which so often draws us into danger. It resembles the fragrant balsam which preserves the corpse from corruption. . . . The ornament of its beauty truly tends to the adornment of the dignity of the priesthood; it is capable of making the priest beloved before God and men."[4]

But if purity shine ever so brightly, yet be without *love,* it has no worth, no merit. What could we attain without love, asks the saint. "Purity without love resembles the lamp without oil. Take away the oil and the lamp shines no more. Take away love and purity is no longer pleasing."[5]

Thirdly, one must dig down to the roots of purity and love: into the depths of *humility.* Purity opens the eyes of the soul, love catches sight of the presence of God, humility preserves this presence and draws upon itself His gifts. For God resists pride; He gives to the humble His graces.

This is the summit, the mystical death. Having attained this peak, the soul is entirely filled with God and radiates Him in all its works. This sight caused St. Bernard the greatest joy. Such a soul God

[3] *Ibid.,* ii, 5: *MPL,* 182, 814-15.
[4] *Ibid.,* iii, 8: *MPL,* 182, cols. 816-17.
[5] *Ibid.,* iii, 9: *MPL,* 182, col. 817.

can well send to men, for it will, in its same purity, return to Him. "He who possesses a clean heart and a right conscience may, with quiet soul, abandon himself, yea, even lose himself in order to win others. With such a soul, he fears not, like Jeremias and Ezechiel, to go to Egypt and Chaldea into captivity with criminals; or with the patient Job, to become the companion of dragons and wild beasts; and what is even more difficult, he trembles not, as Moses, at the prospect that his name will be blotted out of the Book of Life; and with Paul, he also fears not that he himself will be cast away from Christ whilst preaching salvation to his brethren. And should it prove necessary, he would walk with confident steps even over the flames of hell and would sing: 'And should my way lead even through the midst of the shadow of death, I shall fear no evil, for Thou, O Lord, art with me!' "[6]

There remains yet to be examined how the personality of the priest unfolds itself in his life. St. Bernard was not a disciple of Aristotle; his meat was the theology of St. Augustine. On this point, however, both express the same eternal thought, though in a different manner. According to Aristotle, *"Agere sequitur esse."* Being precedes action, and every being unfolds itself in its own peculiar act. St. Augustine expresses the same thought thus: *"Ama, et fac quod vis!"* Be filled with the wealth of being and then will also flow forth from you the strength of God! The reverse of this is also true: each action is without root if it does not stem from the experience of the soul. We can carry this argument further: supernatural life can issue only from supernatural life. St. Bernard describes this in the language of the Gospel where he sets forth St. John the Baptist as the ideal of the priest: *"Ille erat lucerna ardens et lucens"* (*John* 5:35). He utters on this occasion these classic words which are at the same time the most striking summary of his apostolic life: *"Est enim tantum lucere vanum, tantum ardere parum, ardere et lucere perfectum."*[7]

Hence, from this we see that he regards good example in the priest as the most important. After so much disappointment, people long for another world, and this they must find in the life of the priest. "The good and solicitous shepherd ceases not to nourish

[6] *Ibid.*, iv, 13: *MPL*, 182, cols. 818-19.

[7] "Sermo in nativitate S. Joannis Baptistae," No. 3 and 5: *MPL*, 183, cols. 399-400.

his flock with good and shining example, more with his own, than with that of others. For if he teaches with the example of others and not with his own, that redounds to his shame, and the flock will not increase." If he preaches about the meekness of Moses, the patience of Job, the compassion of Samuel, and the piety of David, then he must, above all else, display these virtues in his own life.[8] In his attentiveness, he must portray the picture of the mother, in his firmness, that of the father. In place of the whip, he should show his heart. His vocation is to carry the burden of others, not to become a burden to others.[9]

There is no more tragic disappointment than that which the pastor of souls occasions when men see mirrored in him their own wretchedness, when they see him more interested in earth than in heaven, more interested in material good than in spiritual. It is then that the last hope of a struggling faith collapses, and only God's mercy can rescue the flock. "If the priest is a shepherd and the people the flock, is it then proper that there exists between them no difference? When, like me, who belong to the sheep, my shepherd also turns his face downwards, searches only bodily nourishment on the ground, while his soul, in the meantime, remains unfed, where is the difference between us? Woe, when the wolf comes, and there is no one who is keeping watch, who pursues him, and saves the flock. Is it fitting for the shepherd to indulge the senses after the manner of beasts, to cling to lower things, to crave earthly goods? Should he not rather walk upright, as becoming to man, and look heavenwards, and seek not earthly things but what is above?"[10]

Yes, the priest must be one with his people, but not in the common human weaknesses. He must be at the head, but not in respect to faults. He is like a lightning conductor: he is organically united with the whole, grows out of the whole; pierces his way into heaven by virtue of his ordination. He is not an instrument of the wrath of God, but rather the river of supernatural life which flows through his ministrations into the souls of his people. Therefore, with St. Bernard, the constant prayer for the people precedes every other function. The first task of the pastor is watchfulness in prayer. "Who are these watchmen," exclaims the saint. "Those, to

[8] "Sermo LXXVI in Cantica Canticorum," No. 9: *MPL*, 183, col. 1154.
[9] "Sermo XXIII in Cantica Canticorum," No. 2: *MPL*, 183, cols. 884-85.
[10] "De moribus et officio episcoporum," ii, 5: *MPL*, 182, cols. 814-15.

be sure, whom the Lord in the Gospel calls blessed, for He finds them awake at His return; good watchmen who watch while the others sleep in order to be able to give an account of our souls. Faithful watchmen who, with vigilant soul, pray through the night to spy out with keen eyes the snares of the enemy, anticipate the schemes of the Evil One, discover the hidden daggers, destroy the snares, scatter the nets, thwart their cunning. These are they who love their fellowmen . . . who pray much for the people, and for the Church of God. . . . They watch and pray, because they realize they are inadequate for the protection of the city, and they know that if the Lord keep not the city, the watchmen watch in vain. . . . Therefore take heed, you who have received this charge, take heed to yourselves and to the precious treasure which was entrusted to you."[11]

For the priest, too, it is urgently necessary to withdraw himself into the fruitful stillness of meditation and prayer, so that he, working to save the souls of others, does not lose his own. "What does it profit you," he admonished even the Pope, "if you should win the whole world, but lose yourself? Even if you are wise, your knowledge is defective if you do not take care of yourself."[12] He can conceive nothing more perverse than when someone desires to direct souls to God, meanwhile continually alienating his own self from Him. "If you wish to be all things to all men then will I commend your zeal provided you really belong to all. But how can you belong to all if you exclude yourself from them? If, therefore, you really belong to all, be also one of them. Why would you exclude precisely yourself from your calling?"[13]

But the faithful stand in need of this, too. The apostolic ministry will fail if the priest does not submerge himself again and again into the supernatural depths. St. Bernard knows full well that even the most exalted human spirit will become empty if it does not remain in constant union with the eternal Fountain-Head. He errs, however, who believes it suffices to be in the state of grace in order to be a mediator. The priest must be not just a channel, but rather, he must be a reservoir, for "you squander everything and lose what belongs to you, if you, half-filled, hurriedly pass everything on to

[11] "Sermo LXXVI in Cantica Canticorum," No. 7: *MPL*, 183, 1153.
[12] "De consideratione," Lib. ii, cap. iii, no. 6: *MPL*, 182, 745.
[13] *Ibid.*, Lib. i, cap. v, no. 5-6: *MPL*, 182, col. 734.

others before you are full. . . . Be wise, therefore, become a reservoir and not a channel." And the saint enlarges further on his ever beautiful parable: "Both reservoir and channel have the same purpose: to store up water in themselves and to pass it on. The reservoir, however, waits patiently until it is full, and only then, when it overflows, does it pass on its contents without any kind of harm," but "unfortunately there exist in the Church today many channels and few reservoirs [observes the saint with no little irony] —they have such zeal and love that they wish to give even before they have accumulated anything; before they have learned to be silent, they already wish to speak; before they have learned, they who have not yet learned to direct themselves, already desire to teach and to guide others. . . . Do you also learn, first of all, to become full, and to give out of that fullness, but do not desire to be more lavish than God Himself. The reservoir imitates the spring which becomes a brook and expands itself into a lake when it is full of water . . . do you likewise: first fill yourself to the brim and only thereafter think of giving."[14]

As important as St. Bernard regards the amassing of spiritual riches, so severely does he criticize the accumulation of temporal things. "The Church has been overwhelmed with possessions, but at the same time she has been robbed of her virtues. And how could both have place beside one another if the glorious King became poor for our sakes so that He can say: No one of you can be my disciple who does not forsake all that he possesses.[15] How could that priest who runs after transitory rewards, show enthusiasm for the eternal possessions; how could he endure persecution for justice's sake when he seeks rather earthly recompense than righteousness?"[16]

The saint finds nothing more loathsome in a priest than the spirit of worldliness. On this sphere he does not recoil from even the sharpest criticism: *"quidquid praeter necessarium victum et simplicem vestitum de altari retines, tuum non est; rapina est, sacrilegium est."* And further: "In vain do you justify yourself therewith by saying that God regards not the garb, but rather the conduct.

[14] "Sermo XVIII in Cantica Canticorum," No. 2-4: *MPL*, 183, cols. 859-61.

[15] "Epistola monachorum Clarae-Vallensium et comitum S. Bernardi ad clericos ecclesiae Coloniensis," *MPL*: 185, col. 386.

[16] "De conversione ad clericos sermo seu liber," xxii, 39: *MPL*, 182, cols. 855-56.

As your garb, so is your conduct. . . . Why do priests desire to appear other than as priests?"[17]

Many have objected that he, the monk, meddles in the affairs of the secular clergy. But he maintains contrarily, that if he keeps silent, the distress of the poor will call out. Then "will cry those without clothing, those who suffer hunger; they will ask reproachfully: 'Tell us, O priests, what is the use of the gold on the bridle of the horse? Will the gold stop our shivering with cold? Will it lessen our hunger? Of what benefit to us who suffer cold and hunger are the many garments in your chests and closets? You waste what is ours. You unscrupulously deprive us of what you so frivolously squander. We, too, are God's creatures; Christ's blood has redeemed us also. Therefore, we should be brothers! It is the stolen inheritance of your brother on which your eye feasts itself. For you have in abundance; we, however, are in want. . . . Besides, you have not even earned it yourselves, not by the work of your hands, not by inheritance.' "[18]

The higher the ecclesiastical office that one holds, so much the more must he live for the things of the soul and for the greater tasks. Consequently there is "nothing more offensive than when the bishop busies himself with his furniture and his household matters. He inquires about everything, all things interest him, he is ever suspicious, he settles petty disturbances and seeks worthless baubles. Oh, how erroneous is the judgment of those who occupy themselves with worthless things and neglect the important. But, to speak more clearly, we bear more easily the losses of Christ than our own. How minutely we check our daily expenses, but the losses of God's flock we know not. We discuss daily with our domestics the cost of food, the quantity of bread, but we seldom hold a discussion with our priests about the sins of the people. If an ass falls [he complains bitterly], there will assuredly be found someone to give help; if a soul goes astray, there is no one who takes any heed."[19]

No priest should delude himself that his little gratifications are not evil, for not only the barren tree will be cut down, but also that which did not bring forth good fruit in the right season. To

[17] "De consideratione," Lib. iii, cap. v, no. 9: *MPL*, 182, cols. 769-770.

[18] "De moribus et officio episcoporum," ii, 6-7: *MPL*, 182, cols. 816-17.

[19] "De consideratione," Lib. iv, cap. vi, no. 17, 19-20: *MPL*, 182, cols. 785-86.

be sure, such pleasures can provide small satisfactions, but the true happiness of his soul only his vocation can give. "Happy is the one that can say: 'I have labored more abundantly than all they' (*I Cor.* 15:10). That is the glory of the priest, but it is not a glory that makes one conceited, that weakens, or destroys. If the labor repels, the reward should encourage. For one day each will receive a reward commensurate with his labors."[20]

And if he sees no fruit of his labors, even then he should not become discouraged. "Plant, water, work, and you have done your part. For it is not you but God who gives the increase, there where it pleases Him. That is the true labor which no failure brings to nought."[21]

The priestly ideal of St. Bernard is, therefore, the saint who lives in God, and with God, and for God. This is marked by a definite Christian pragmatism. "What did, and do the holy Apostles teach us," he asks one time. "Not the manual skills of the fisherman's trade, not tentmaking, or the like professions, not to read Plato, or to unravel the intricate riddles of Aristotle, not just to study continuously, and never to arrive at the possession of truth. They taught me to live! Do you think it is a small matter to be able to live? Oh, it is something great, the greatest!"[22]

Concluding may the hope be expressed that the words of St. Bernard find realization in priests: *"Ut sint speculum et exemplum, ac quoddam veluti condimentum vitae hominum super terram. Per hoc enim quodammodo apud nos etiam post mortem vivunt, multosque ex his, qui viventes mortui sunt, ad veram provocant et revocant vitam."*[23]

BEDE LACKNER, S.O.Cist.

Cistercian Monastery
Okauchee, Wisconsin

[20] *Ibid.*, Lib. ii, cap. vi, no. 12: *MPL*, 182, col. 749.
[21] *Ibid.*, Lib. iv, cap. ii, no. 2: *MPL*, 182, cols. 772-73.
[22] "Sermo I in festo SS. Petri et Pauli apostolorum," *MPL*, 183, col. 407.
[23] "De vita et rebus gestis S. Malachiae Hiberniae episcopi," *MPL*: 182, col. 1073.

AN EVALUATION OF GRAECO-RUSSIAN THEOLOGY

The Mystical Body of Christ, the Church, was born on the hill of Calvary over nineteen hundred years ago. Even in its earliest days the growth and development of the Mystical Body was impeded by schism and heresy. In the fifth century, two important heresies, the Nestorian and Monophysite, divided the Eastern and Western Churches. Out of these two fifth-century errors developed two groups of separated Oriental Christians which are in existence today, though with a comparatively small following.

The largest number of separated Orientals,[1] however, are to be found in the Eastern Orthodox Church. They were called Orthodox because they remained faithful to the Church when the Nestorians and the Monophysites became heretics in the fifth century. This name has persevered through the centuries and as such they are known today. Their final break with Rome came in 1054, definitive since 1472, and from this great schism, eighteen separate and self-governing Churches resulted. Today, some 160 millions comprise the Eastern Orthodox Church, and between four-fifths and nine-tenths of these belong to the Russian Church.

The Orthodox have the general means of grace, and the seven sacraments are usually considered to be validly confected by their clergy. Despite this, however, they are torn asunder from the Body of Christ since they fail to recognize His Vicar on earth, the Holy Father. Yet, the cleft that was formed by the schism is not as wide as it would have been, had the Dissidents not retained so much in common with the true Church, especially concerning the fundamental, theological concepts of the Church.

Another name for the present day Eastern Orthodox Church is the Graeco-Russian Church, which is made up of the different autocephalic churches of the Byzantine Rite. It is not one sole Church, but several churches independent one of another, admin-

[1] By Orientals, of course, we mean not those of the Far East like the Japanese and the Chinese, but the Orientals of the Near East: those who, roughly speaking, live in the Eastern part of Europe, the Western part of Asia and the North-East part of Africa. The largest number of these today must be looked for behind the Iron Curtain.

istering themselves in an autonomous fashion in large measure, and in general undergoing the interference of the state in which they are located. Each one is divided into a certain number of dioceses having bishops at their head in the Catholic manner. The central power is habitually constituted by one or more synods of variable composition. The personal government of one sole prelate is excluded. All decisions are collegiate.

The Eastern Orthodox Church is radically distinguished from the Catholic Church by the absence of all common and permanent supreme authority. They acknowledge a transitory and common supreme authority in the Ecumenical Council. But, as a matter of fact, the authority of this council is purely theoretical for them because no assembly of this kind has been held since the Seventh Ecumenical Council, the second of Nicea, in 787.

Taken in its totality, the Graeco-Russian Church approaches Catholicism more than any other non-Catholic group. In differing degrees, one finds almost all the Catholic elements within it. It lacks hardly anything excepting the Pope and that which this lack supposes. Between the Graeco-Russian Church and the Catholic Church, union would, at a first glance, be very easy to realize. However, the great barrier is that of age-old prejudices created by the antipathy between Greeks and Latins, and above all by political events. Moreover, the divergence between West and East is concerned with the entire conception of the Church, and to neglect this aspect in the question of union would be, so to speak, risking a superficial conception of the whole problem.

Looking at the problem from our side, a true dogmatic barrier definitely exists between the Catholic Church and Graeco-Russian Church. Such dogmas as the following are definitively proclaimed in the Catholic Church: the primacy of jurisdiction by Divine Right and the personal Infallibility of the Bishop of Rome in matters of faith and morals, the eternal Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son (*filioque*) as from one sole principle, the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, the Assumption, the existence of a temporary and intermediary state between Heaven and Hell after death which we call Purgatory, the immediate retribution made to the souls of the deceased after death, whether it be of recompense or chastisement. No more discussion is possible among us as to the truth contained in these dogmas. If the dissident

does not wish to admit these dogmas, he can not enter into the true fold of Peter.

There is nothing of this sort from the side of the Graeco-Russian Church. That Church possesses no fixed and definite teaching on any of the doctrinal points mentioned above. The faithful can hold the pro or the con in regard to each one of them. And, amazing to say, some very prominent theologians in the Orthodox Church have held the primacy of the Pope, successor of Peter, and were not anathematized.[2]

Since the Graeco-Russian Church holds that the Ecumenical Council is the supreme authority and that the Church, by itself, cannot definite dogmas, each theologian, as a matter of fact, has substituted himself for the Church in defining *orthodoxy*. This is the phenomenon which the history of the Graeco-Russian theology has revealed to us and which has duped many a theologian of the West. Because one has read in a certain manual of Greek or Russian theology, that the Graeco-Russian Church teaches the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father alone, that she denies the Immaculate Conception or purgatory, he may immediately come to the conclusion that the Orthodox *Church* teaches these heresies. However, that deduction would not be true to fact. The truth is this: In the Graeco-Russian Church there are many *theologians* who teach heresies, there are others who hold questionable theses, and some who hold to true Catholic doctrine.

Certain dissident theologians have clearly perceived this almost inevitable default of the private theologians, and they have also seen the lack of consistency among the particular synods of the autocephalic Churches. As a result, some dissident theologians instinctively feel the inadequacy of such a system of holding to the truth, and have expressed themselves publicly in this matter.

The famous Russian canonist Souvorov declared in his work on Ecclesiastical Law: "Among us, that which is called orthodoxy is not very clear."[3] Another Russian theologian, Molojsky, had written

[2] The classical example on this point was George Scholarios who was a prominent Byzantine theologian of the fifteenth century and who also became Patriarch of Constantinople, taking the name of Gennadius II. For further information on Scholarios, seee M. Jugie's article "Will Union Be Easy For the Orientals?" *Unitas,* 1 (1949), 56 ff.

[3] Souvorov, *Manual of Ecclesiastical Law,* 4th ed. (Moscow, 1912), p. 212.

in a Russian review something more clearly to the point: "Among us there is not one orthodoxy, but different orthodoxies. Orthodoxy assumes special properties for each individual. Briefly, there are as many orthodoxies as there are noted theologians in the orthodox world."[4]

The first principle of Graeco-Russian theology of the present time is that the obligatory object of faith (the dogmatic element properly-so-called that all the faithful must accept) is based on the express definitions of the ecumenical councils. The infallible magisterium of the Church has only one organ for expressing itself—it is the ecumenical council. As long as no such council has pronounced on a question, it remains matter for free discussion. Hence, for the past 1,171 years, to be precise, the infallible voice of the Church has not made itself heard for the faithful of Graeco-Russian dissidents. The explicit and direct definitions of the first seven ecumenical councils form the central nucleus of common orthodoxy.

Today, some Russian and Greek theologians want to determine certain dogmatic truths which were not in the ecumenical councils of the first eight centuries. Others seem to throw overboard all the theological, speculative work accomplished in the autocephalic Churches since the separation from Rome for the reason that the dissident theology had undergone the influence at one time of Catholicism, and at another of Protestantism. The latter group would seem to think that it was necessary to return to the source of true orthodoxy, namely, to the teachings of the Fathers. Consequently, we return once more to the year *787*!

The great weakness of Orthodox theology as a whole is that it falls between two ideals. They insist very much on the antiquity of their belief and rites. Antiquity, pure and unchanged, and no modification for modern times, is their great cry. They indignantly deny that their Church has ever "developed," and they never tire of protesting against Latin "novelties." The question for them to answer is: "Why develop down to the year *787* and then rigidly refuse to move any further?"

Protestants think the Orthodox, with their images, relics, vestments and incense are as corrupt as any Papist; the Catholics think of their Church as dead or still in the process of dying. The

[4] Molojsky, in *Century* (Viek, 1907), No. 25, col. 391.

radical affliction from which the Orthodox Church suffers is arrested development. In spite of its boast of unchanging antiquity, its theology, rites and Canon Law represent not the first ages, but a comparatively advanced development—that of the Byzantine period. And there they stay, to all appearances at least, satisfying neither the need of continuous development which is the mark of a living Church, nor the rival idea of unchanged primitive observance.

As for the position of the Graeco-Russian Church in relation to the Catholic Church, an authority on the subject writes: "Orthodoxy is something more than a 'static edition of Catholicism minus the Pope,' or a 'kind of golden mean between Catholicism and Protestantism,' though what the particular essential quality of Orthodox Christianity is, has never yet been satisfactorily defined and formulated. This fundamental uncertainty is in large measure due to the varied and often conflicting views of the Orthodox themselves."[5]

Thus, to sum up the schism as it exists today, we may state that the crux of the problem of reunion lies essentially in the fact that the Graeco-Russian Church denies the jurisdiction of Christ's Vicar on earth. Other points of difference mostly amount to a rejection not by the common dissident Christians, but by certain elements within the Orthodox hierarchy of Catholic teaching concerning the Holy Trinity, the Immaculate Conception, the Assumption and purgatory.

JOHN BAPTIST TERBOVICH, O.F.M.CAP.

Capuchin College
Washington, D. C.

[5] D. Attwater, *The Christian Churches of the East* (Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Company, 1947-48), I, 177.

THE USE OF "EKKLESIA" IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

I

It is not particularly surprising that when we come to examine the use of the word *"ekklesia"* in the New Testament, we find that there is a great similarity between its usage there and at the present time. The doctrine and terminology of the present-day Church arose from the New Testament era. As a result, we need not speak of any "extrascriptural" meaning of the word *"ekklesia"* that might compare to the use in Scripture. Quite the contrary, the post-apostolic formulation of the doctrine is the legitimate outgrowth of the scriptural manner of speech.

In other words, we are not faced so much with a problem of a conflict of any sort between the word as we use it today and its use in the inspired books. The close relationship of the one to the other is only too apparent. This is not to say that there is no difference whatsoever. There has been, obviously, a greater clarification of the doctrine on the Church during the last two thousand years, with a resulting precision in the meaning of the word "church" itself. Because of this, any reader of Scripture in the twentieth century will carry with him some very definite notions about the precise meaning of that word. As an almost automatic theological reaction, he will think in terms of these later precisions when reading the pages of the New Testament. This is true of many words in our theological vocabulary, and it is something that must be considered by anyone desiring to analyze the meaning of a particular word as used in the first century.

There is, however, no question for the Catholic theologian of any essential change in the meaning of the word, nor of any unlawful and unwarranted evolution. Granted that there has been a greater precision in meaning associated with the word, the Catholic principle of doctrinal development insists that it has been a valid, and, to use the phrase of Marín-Sola, a "homogeneous" evolution or development. On the other hand, we will not come to a precise understanding of the word in Scripture unless we try as

far as possible to avoid reading into the inspired books the more highly developed connotations which—though lawful and just—represent the activity of the Holy Spirit in the living tradition of the Church.

One further note: a study of an individual word in Scripture has its particular value, but it is not a case of attempting to establish the entire teaching of the Church on the basis of how one particular word or phrase may have been used. After all, if we were to blot out every use of the word *"ekklesia"* in the New Testament, the doctrine itself would stand secure. There is more than abundant scriptural testimony, couched in other terms, to the existence of the Church—the reality itself. This is but a further study, a particular interest because of the importance of the word in later centuries.

In English, as in German and other Northern languages, we have a word that is not a derivative of the scriptural *"ekklesia,"* as are *église, chiesa, iglesia.* It has been variously derived from the Greek *"kyrios"* as well as the Latin *"curia"* or *"circus."* It would seem most probable, however, that it came from the Greek *"kyriakon,"* meaning a place of worship: the house of the Lord. In the language of the people it was corrupted into *"kyrike,"* and hence *"Kirche"* in German, *"church"* in English.[1]

The English translation of the word *"ekklesia"* in the New Testament is almost always *"church,"* but we do find instances in which the words "assembly" or "congregation" have been used. Some have even suggested that in certain passages these other words would convey the exact meaning somewhat better. The Jerusalem Bible, for example, translates *"ekklesia"* in the fourteenth chapter of First Corinthians as *"l'assemblée."* But this would be more the exception.

Of far more interest is the precise meaning of the word as it appears in individual passages. We must imagine, of course, that when the word was first introduced into the early Christian community, it conveyed some more or less precise notion, despite any

[1] Cf. Karl Ludwig Schmidt, *The Church* (translated from Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* by J. R. Coates) (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1957), p. 59, note 1; Michael Schmaus, *Katholische Dogmatik* (Munich: Max Hueber, 1958) III, Part I, 26; Trübner-Götze, *Deutsches Wörterbuch,* IV (1943), 148 ff.

variances. There had to be some reason for making use of this particular word. Even within the first century, the primitive Church obviously added certain specifically Christian overtones to the meaning of that word, and extended it to more abstract notions; it is this manner of speech that developed among the early Christians that is reflected in the inspired books we now possess. But it would hardly seem likely that the early Church "created" an entirely new meaning for the word *"ekklesia,"* a meaning that had not even been hinted at in previous centuries.

Of the two possible sources for the use of this word by the Christians, it would seem that the more likely one would be the religious use of the term *"ekklesia"* among the Greek-speaking Jews. The secular meaning of the word was limited to purely civil gatherings, but the Jewish use tended to indicate a special group, an elite of some sort, related to God in a special manner. Thus there is good reason for looking upon this Jewish use (as evidenced in the Septaugint) as the starting place for this Christian usage.[2]

In the New Testament, we do find two passages which reflect this Old Testament use of the word. In one instance, Psalm 21 is quoted in the Epistle to the Hebrews as representing the words of Christ: "For which cause he [Jesus] is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying: 'I will declare thy name to my brethren; in the midst of the church *(ekklesia)* I will praise thee.' "[3]

In the other passage, Stephen refers to the children of Israel in his discourse before the Sanhedrin: "This is he [Moses] who was in the assembly *(ekklesia)* in the wilderness with the angel who spoke to him on Mount Sinai, and with our fathers, and he received the words of life to give to us."[4]

There are some interesting points connected with the use of the word *"ekklesia"* in the New Testament, however. It appears in all about 115 times.[5] With two exceptions, it is never used in the

[2] Cf. John L. Murphy, " 'Ekklesia' and the Septuagint," in *AER,* CXXXIX, 6 (Dec., 1958), 381 ff.

[3] *Heb.* 2:11-12 (*Ps.* 21:23).

[4] *Acts* 7:38.

[5] Cf. J. B. Smith, *Greek-English Concordance to the New Testament* (Scottdale, Penn.: Herald Press, 1955), *"ekklesia,"* No. 1577. There is in all of these questions some slight variance as to the number of times a particular word appears, depending upon the reading of various texts. Smith,

Gospels. It does not appear at all in Mark, Luke and John; it is found only twice in Matthew—in the Petrine text (Matt. 16:18) and in the discussion on fraternal correction (Matt. 18:16-17). It is used frequently in the Acts of the Apostles, and in all of the Epistles of St. Paul except two: Titus and II Timothy. In the seven Catholic Epistles, *"ekklesia"* appears only four times: once in James, and three times in III John. It is used a number of times in the opening chapters of the Apocalypse.

It is frequently pointed out as significant that the word does not appear in the two letters of St. Peter. There is, of course, no validity in an argument that begins by concluding first of all that Peter should have used one or another word, and then raising a grave problem because he did not use it. Peter may simply have not wished to use the word we ourselves have settled on; any critical approach must still grant the right of an author, inspired or not, to use whatever words he chooses.

On the other hand, if the word was used with any amount of frequency by the early Christians, one may at least wonder how Peter could have written an Epistle that is so obviously ecclesiological in tone, and not have almost necessarily used *"ekklesia"* somewhere along the line. It is a question that may be raised, but possibly never answered. It is clear enough, however, that when St. Peter says to the presbyters "tend the flock of God which is among you, governing not under constraint, but willingly, according to God,"[6] he is envisioning the same situation Paul had in mind when he asked concerning the bishop: "For if a man cannot rule well his own household, how is he to take care of the *church* of God?"[7] Peter's less Hellenistic background would naturally incline him to speak of the same reality in terms redolent of the Old Testament Hebrew rather than the vocabulary of Greek-speaking Jews.

As was noted previously, the secular use of the word among the Greeks was limited more to the notion of an actual "gathering-together" of the citizens in one place—an assembly.[8] We have one

for example, includes *Acts* 2:47 in this enumeration whereas others do not. In regard to the reading, cf. Merk, *Novum Testamentum, ad locum.*

[6] *I Pet.* 5:2.

[7] *I Tim.* 3:5.

[8] Cf. Murphy, *loc. cit.*, p. 381.

instance of the use of *"ekklesia"* in this sense in the Acts; it is concerned with a non-religious assembly. We read of the reaction of the silversmiths at Ephesus who, in business-like fashion, feared that Paul's teaching that "Gods made by human hands are not gods at all," would put them out of business (and incidentally detract from the worship of the great Diana).[9] The city was roused to a great fury, and the citizens rushed to the theatre, most of them not even knowing why they had come there. This gathering, then, is described as an *"ekklesia."* As Luke notes: ". . . for the assembly *(ekklesia)* was in confusion, and most of them did not know why they had gathered together."[10]

This is a good example of the meaning of the word as it appears in secular Greek literature, an extension of the more limited meaning attached to it originally. The town clerk finally dismissed this assembly *(ekklesia)* with the appeal that "if you require anything further, it shall be settled in the lawful assembly *(ekklesia),"*[11] that is, in a gathering that would have legal standing, having been called together precisely to attend to the problems of the city.

In the New Testament, we find a similar notion of a religious gathering, an "assembly" of Christians. St. Paul will say to the Corinthians: "For first of all I hear that when you meet in church *(ekklesia)* there are divisions among you, and in part I believe it."[12] He means here "when you meet together in the assembly," or "when you assemble as the church." The use of the word to indicate a church building did not appear until the liturgical functions had been moved out of private homes into buildings set aside specifically for the worship of the Christian community.

This would seem to be the same meaning intended in verse 22: "Or do you despise the church *(ekklesia)* of God and put to shame the needy."[13] It is difficult to say: Paul could be speaking either of the community gathered here and now for worship, or in the more abstract sense of existing in a particular place. The remainder of the passage, however, clearly indicates the assembled congregation. In regard to how one ought to act in this assembly, Paul

[9] *Acts* 19: 23 ff.
[10] *Acts* 19: 32.
[11] *Acts* 19: 39-40.
[12] *I Cor.* 11: 18.
[13] *I Cor.* 11: 22.

begins by noting that he who speaks tongues edifies only himself (and not those who stand about him), whereas the man who prophesies "edifies the church" *(ekklesia)*—that is, the entire assembly.[14] Paul also assures us that "in the church *(ekklesia)*, I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that I may also instruct others, than ten thousand words in a tongue."[15] Women are also instructed to keep silence in these assemblies *(ekklesia)* for it is unseemly for a woman to speak there.[16]

In many other New Testament passages, however, we can note a broader meaning of the word, or more properly, broader *meanings:* the word does not always indicate even here precisely the same thing in each passage. Apart from a special gathering for liturgical worship, the word *"ekklesia"* is also used to indicate the faithful of a particular city or district, as well as the faithful considered as an organized body, but with no special consideration of locality, even in the broader sense of a certain city or district. Added to this is the notion of the *"ekklesia"* as the faithful simply as they are related to Christ, their Saviour and divine Head. It is this divergence in terminology which has given rise to a special question, to which we will return later, concerning the primary and the secondary meaning of the term in the New Testament vocabulary.

In many instances, therefore, the word *"ekklesia"* indicates not a particular liturgical assembly, but the community of believers, more or less gathered together as one unit in a particular city or district. Many of Paul's Epistles begin with phrases that indicate such a notion: ". . . to the church *(ekklesia)* of God at Corinth,"[17] ". . . to the *church* of the Thessalonians,"[18] or ". . . to the *churches* of Galatia."[19] This is a more localized meaning of the term.

In I Corinthians Paul indicates very clearly the use of the word *"ekklesia"* to signify something more general than an assembly

[14] *I Cor.* 14:4. Cf. also *I Cor.* 14:5, 12.
[15] *I Cor.* 14:19.
[16] *I Cor.* 14:34-35.
[17] *I Cor.* 1:2; *II Cor.* 1:1.
[18] *I Thess.* 1:1; *II Thess.* 1:1.
[19] *Gal.* 1:2. Cf. also: churches of Asia (*I Cor.* 16:19); of Galatia (*I Cor.* 16:1); of Macedonia (*II Cor.* 8:1); of Judea (*Gal.* 1:22; *I Thess.* 2:14); of the Laodiceans (*Col.* 4:16); at Cenchrae (*Rom* 16:1). And in the *Acts*: The church at Jerusalem (*Acts* 8:1; 11:22; 15:4; 18:22); at Antioch (*Acts* 13:1, 14:26; 15:3).

for liturgical worship. In discussing the various gifts of the Spirit, he speaks often enough of the "church" as an "assembly," he also includes the phrase: "Therefore, if the whole church *(ekklesia)* be *assembled* together and, while all are speaking with tongues, there should come in uninstructed persons or unbelievers, will they not say that you are mad?"[20] It is, therefore, the faithful themselves —the *"ekklesia"*—that are assembled together, who make up the assembly. It is an indication of the ease with which Paul moves from one meaning of the word to another.

In the Apocalypse, St. John uses this same manner of speech in communicating his message to the individual churches: ". . . to the angel of the *church* at Ephesus . . . at Smyrna . . . at Pergamum," and so forth.[21] He announces at the very start that it is his intention to write to the "seven churches that are in Asia,"[22] and this fact is recalled in the ending attached to each particular letter: "He who has an ear, let him hear what the Spirit says to the *churches*. . . ."[23]

Upon occasion, this notion of the *"ekklesia"* as a local group of believers is even limited to the number of those Christians who gathered together at a particular house within a city. St. Paul writes to Philemon, for example, "and to the *church* that is in thy house,"[24] and he sends his greetings to Nymphas and the *church* that is in his house at Laodicea.[25]

At times, it is also the local church that is involved in some kind of activity, although not mentioned by name in the particular text. The early community at Jerusalem is described as filled with wonderment at the events surrounding the case of Ananias and his wife Sapphira: "And great fear came upon the whole church

[20] *I Cor.* 14:23: Ἐὰν οὖν συνέλθῃ ἡ ἐκκλησία ὅλη ἐπὶ το αὐτὸ. . . . So also *Acts* 14:27: "they called the church together. . . .": συναγαγόντες τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. . . .

[21] *Apoc.* 2:1. Cf. also: *Apoc.* 2:8, 12, 18; 3:1, 7, 14.

[22] *Apoc.* 1:4. Cf. also: *Apoc.* 1:11, 20; 22:16.

[23] *Apoc.* 2:7, 11, 17, 29; 3:6, 13, 22. Similarly, *Apoc.* 2:23: ". . . and all the *churches* shall know that I am he who searches desires and hearts. . . ."

[24] *Philom.* 1:2.

[25] *Col.* 4:15. Cf. also: *I Cor.* 16:19; *Rom.* 16:5. (Possibly *Rom.* 16:23 is also to be understood in this sense: "Gaius, my host, and the host of the whole *church,* greets you." It may indicate that the faithful met at the house of Gaius, accepting his hospitality for the holding of liturgical services.)

(ekklesia) and upon all who heard of this."[26] It is reported, also, that Herod "set hands on certain members of the *church* to persecute them,"[27] certain members, it would seem, of the Christian community at Jerusalem. When Peter was then imprisoned, "prayer was being made to God for him by the *church* without ceasing," apparently indicating again the church at Jerusalem.[28]

In speaking to the Corinthians, Paul asks them to pick out certain members of the community to act as judges in disputes that might arise between Christians: "If, therefore, you have cases about worldly matters to be judged, appoint those who are rated as nothing in the *church* to judge"—apparently those in the community at Corinth.[29] At the meeting in Jerusalem, we read that "the apostles and the presbyters with the whole *church* decided to select representatives and to send them to Antioch. . . ."[30] It would seem that the entire Christian community at Jerusalem gathered together for this assembly, although the apostles and presbyters are singled out from the others as playing a special role in the proceedings.[31] Paul and Barnabas had been sent to this meeting "by the *church,*" that is at Antioch.[32] So also when Paul later passed among the various local Christian communities, giving them the

[26] *Acts* 5:11.
[27] *Acts* 12:1.
[28] *Acts* 12:5.
[29] *I Cor.* 6:4.
[30] *Acts* 15:22.
[31] *Acts* 15:23: this passage is translated in various fashions: "The apostles and ancients, brethren. . . ," "their brethren, the apostles and presbyters. . . ," "the brethren, both the apostles and the elders. . . ," "the brethren who are apostles and presbyters. . . ." In all events, these particular members of the Church are singled out from the rest of the community. These words are the opening words of the letter to be sent to the other churches. It is significant that Paul and Barnabas came "to the apostles and presbyters at Jerusalem about this question," (*Acts* 15:2). Thus the phrase "being assembled together" (*Acts* 15:25) does not necessarily exclude the possibility that the other members of the church also attended the gathering, since the entire context apparently emphasizes simply the authority of certain members of this community. But it does not seem that by "brethren" we are to understand the entire community at Jerusalem (v. 23).
[32] *Acts* 15:3. Again, the meaning of the passage is vague: it may mean "sent them on their way. . . ," or "saw them on their way. . . ," "given provisions by the church. . . ," or even "escorted by the church. . . ." It indicates, in all cases, of course, the community at Antioch.

decisions that had been reached in Jerusalem, St. Luke sums up the general result of all this: "So the *churches* grew stronger and stronger in the faith and increased in numbers daily."[33]

In a similar way, on his first missionary journey, Paul visited various cities, and "appointed presbyters for them in each *church*. . . ."[34] At the start of his second missionary journey, Paul is quoted as saying to Barnabas: "Let us return and visit the brethren in all the cities where we have preached the word of the Lord, to see how they are doing,"[35] and thereupon, after the difficulty with Barnabas, Paul "travelled through Syria and Cilicia, and strengthened the *churches*."[36] And before he set out for Jerusalem the last time, Paul "sent to Ephesus for the presbyters of the *church*," to bid them farewell.[37]

In his Third Epistle, St. John seems to be referring also to a local church. He writes, first, that others have given nothing but good reports concerning Gaius: "They have born witness to thy love before the *church*,"[38] presumably the church at Ephesus. He also remarks that he "would have written perhaps to the *church*," meaning the local community,[39] but Diotrephes, either the bishop or a priest of that church, was not friendly to John or to the itinerant preachers sent by him. Diotrephes had, in fact, refused to receive these preachers, and had even opposed those people who did so: "He himself does not receive the brethren, and those who do so he hinders, and casts them out of the *church*."[40] It would seem that Diotrephes was either excluding these people from the Christian community for what they had done, or, if he was a priest, excluding them from the assembly or services. It is difficult to determine the precise meaning of *"ekklesia"* in this passage.

From these various passages, therefore, we are able to determine two clear meanings of the word "church" in the New Testament. It is used to designate a liturgical assembly, on the one hand, and a Christian community of a particular city or district, on the other. In point of fact, there is a close relationship between these two notions, and Paul uses them both in I Corinthians. It is the

[33] *Acts* 16:5.
[34] *Acts* 14:22.
[35] *Acts* 15:36.
[36] *Acts* 15:41.
[37] *Acts* 20:18, 28.
[38] *III John* 6.
[39] *III John* 9.
[40] *III John* 10.

"ekklesia," considered as the faithful in a particular locality, which forms the *"ekklesia,"* considered as the liturgical assembly.

We find something similar in the use of the word *"ekklesia"* in the Septuagint. It designated both a liturgical assembly—especially in the Psalms—but it also designated the people of God as gathered together in a particular locality: the assembly of Judah and Jerusalem.[41] By the time the Christian community was formed, it would appear that the word *"ekklesia"* was an apt enough phrase to describe either a religious assembly or a religious community, without carrying the strong local or national connotations that seem to have been associated with the word *"synagoge."* In the New Testament, this word is used, almost without exception, to refer to the Jewish synagogue. The one use of it to refer to a Christian gathering indicates an assembly in the strict sense; it is used by St. James: "For if a man in fine apparel, having a gold ring, enters your assembly *(synagoge)*, and a poor man in mean attire enters also. . . ."[42]

On the other hand, as was also true of the use of *"ekklesia"* in the Septuagint, the use of the word in the New Testament is extended to designate a far more abstract notion of a community as well. If, in the Septuagint, the word was especially chosen to speak of the "children of God" precisely as His chosen ones, it designates no less the "followers of Christ" in the New Testament. In this fashion, the word "church" is also used to designate this Christian community considered apart from all local circumstances, simply as the followers of Christ, the members of Christ, united in faith and organized in some visible fashion. There can be no doubt that the New Testament adds much to the meaning of the word *"ekklesia,"* over and above its use in the Septuagint, but the general tendencies are much the same. It is, then, to this more abstract notion of the word "church" that we will now turn our attention.

(To be continued)

JOHN L. MURPHY

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[41] Cf. Murphy, *loc. cit.*, pp. 386 f.
[42] *James* 2:2.

THE STUDY OF THE ECUMENICAL COUNCIL

The immediate effect of Pope John's announcement, on Jan. 25 of this year, that he intends to summon an ecumenical council of the Catholic Church, was a spontaneous expression of joy from every part of the Catholic world. And, as the priests of the Church have learned by personal experience, that announcement aroused at least as much intense interest, on the part of the faithful and also among non-members of the Church, as any previous Vatican announcement during our lifetime. Rare indeed must be the American priest who has not been called upon to answer an unprecedented number of questions about the nature and the work of the ecumenical council.

As a result there has been a definite effort, on the part of priests and seminarians particularly, to learn more about the councils of the Church. Even considered by itself, this more intensive study of the councils is bound to have a highly beneficial effect within the Church. Unfortunately the treatment given to the study of the councils in many seminary courses during the past few years tended to be somewhat inadequate.

There are four distinct disciplines from which the student can learn truth about the ecumenical councils and the other councils of the Catholic Church. These are: scholastic theology, positive theology, canon law, and ecclesiastical history. Each of these has its own unique and highly important contribution to make towards a proper understanding of the type of council recently announced and promised by the Sovereign Pontiff.

SCHOLASTIC THEOLOGY

In the current manual literature of fundamental dogmatic theology the teaching *de conciliis oecumenicis* constitutes a part, and a somewhat inconspicuous part, of the *tractatus de ecclesia Christi.* It is very important to remember that this arrangement is not particularly old, as it is seen against the perspective of the history of Catholic theology. Thus, in the classical fourteenth-century *Summa de ecclesia* of the Cardinal John de Turrecremata, the third of the four books of which this work is composed is entitled *De universalibus conciliis*

et de eorum auctoritate. In the closely printed Venice edition of 1561, this book on the ecumenical councils runs to 168 pages.

In Melchior Cano's great work of theological methodology, *De locis theologicis,* the authority of the ecumenical councils is given its own distinct section, along with those assigned to the authority of the universal Church and the one dealing with the authority of the Roman Church. The beautifully organized *Controversies* of St. Robert Bellarmine contain one book "On the Councils and the Church" and another "On the Authority of the Councils." The shorter but no less brilliant *Controversies* of the Douai professor Francis Sylvius give adequate treatment to each of the first seven of the *loci* described in Melchior Cano's volume. Sylvius' teaching on the councils of the Church is particularly valuable.

A generation or so before Sylvius began to write there was the first attempt to incorporate the treatises on the Church, on the Roman Pontiff, and on the Councils, into the fabric of scholastic theology properly so-called. The works previously mentioned were written by outstanding scholastic theologians, but in their writings they were not brought into the framework of what was actually the science of scholastic theology. They were primarily controversial or polemical in their orientation.

It was not until late in the sixteenth century that theologians like Francis Suarez, John Wiggers, Gregory of Valentia, and Adam Tanner began to bring the contents of these three treatises into the text of the commentaries on St. Thomas' *Summa theologica* which then stood as the standard works of scholastic theology in the strict sense of the term. The treatise on the Church which finally entered into the body of scholastic theology was not exactly the material set forth in Turrecremata's *Summa de ecclesia,* but rather the kind of counter-Reformation controversy which formed the body of St. Robert Bellarmine's *De ecclesia militante* and his *De notis ecclesiae.* The treatise on the Roman Pontiff was not radically changed from the status it had in the text of Turrecremata, but it was considerably enriched by the researches of the counter-Reformation theologians. The treatise on the councils, however, entered the area of scholastic theology in much the same condition in which it is to be found in the third book of the *Summa de ecclesia.*

For Suarez and the other pioneers who placed these treatises in the text of scholastic theology, they were parts of a rather formidable

appendix to the *tractatus de fide*. And the men who commented the *Summa theologica* question by question and article by article tended to place these treatises after the commentary on article ten of the first question in the *secunda secundae*. This was a somewhat awkward arrangement, and it did not carry over very extensively into what might be called the popular manual literature of scholastic theology.

By the beginning of the eighteenth century, the treatise *de ecclesia Christi* tended to gravitate towards the introduction to the course in scholastic theology, and eventually to be integrated, as a *tractatus de religione catholica,* into the body of scholastic apologetics. Under these circumstances the treatises on the Roman Pontiff and on the Councils of the Church tended to become parts of an enlarged treatise on the Church. In the process, the treatises on the Sovereign Pontiff and on the Councils tended to be shortened. The overpowering nineteenth-century interest in the doctrine of papal infallibility assured something like an adequate treatment of this subject. Unfortunately, however, there was no corresponding interest in the theology of the councils, and thus this particular subject fell into something like neglect. Ultimately the theological treatment of the councils in the manual literature of the seminaries came to include little more than a commentary on the canon law of the councils.

Even in the writings of classical theologians like Turrecremata, St. Robert Bellarmine, and Francis Sylvius, and in the highly competent articles on councils in the *Catholic Encyclopedia* and the *Dictionnaire de theologie catholique,* there are comparatively few theological theses on the subject of the ecumenical councils of the Catholic Church. The scholastic theology on this subject tells of the nature, the purpose, and the competence of these gatherings. It enumerates and briefly describes the assemblies recognized as ecumenical councils, and takes explicit cognizance of the fact that some of the gatherings so classified were originally neither summoned, conducted, nor approved as ecumenical councils. It shows that these latter assemblies owe their present position to the fact that subsequent action by the Holy See gave at least some of their rulings the status of decrees emanating from an ecumenical council.

In his famed encyclical *Humani generis,* the late and great Pope Pius XII repeated the admonition of Pius IX, the Pope of the Vatican Council, to the effect that the noblest function of sacred theology is that of showing how the doctrines defined by the

magisterium of the Catholic Church are contained in the sources of revelation, that is, in Scripture and in divine apostolic tradition, in exactly the same sense and meaning in which they have been defined by the *magisterium.*[1] This is just as true for that section of theology that deals with the ecumenical councils as it is for any other section of the sacred science. Yet there are factors inherent in the *tractatus de conciliis oecumenicis* which tend to make the carrying out of this noblest function of theology somewhat more difficult here than in most other sections of scholastic theology.

Basically the difficulty stems from the fact that the content of the revealed and supernatural Christian message which is set forth in Scripture and in divine apostolic tradition was closed with the death of the last apostle, an event which must be located around the end of the first century of the Christian era. On the other hand, the first of the councils which the Catholic Church recognizes as truly ecumenical is Nicea I, which was held in the year 325. In this light it should be quite clear that we must not expect to find in the original deposit of divine public revelation any statement bearing explicitly and directly on the nature or the authority of ecumenical councils. There is certainly a great deal formally revealed about these gatherings, but this information is contained in the original deposit in a definitely implicit way.

Actually the fundamental theological teaching about the ecumenical councils of the Catholic Church is to be found in what was explicitly revealed about the nature of the ecclesiastical *magisterium* itself and in what Scripture and divine apostolic tradition have to tell us about the connaturality of the conciliar mode of operation within the *magisterium,* or the Church's hierarchy of jurisdiction. During the period that followed immediately upon Our Lord's Ascension into heaven and the first Christian Pentecost, the members of the apostolic college constituted the *ecclesia docens.* And it is a matter of scriptural record that the apostles, with Peter at their head, chose to act *conciliariter* many times, and most notably on the occasion of the Council of Jerusalem.[2] At that time, as the book of the Acts of the Apostles shows us very clearly, the group itself, considering itself precisely as an assembly or a group, brought out the fact that it spoke with divine guidance and with divine

[1] Cf. NCWC Translation, n. 21.
[2] Cf. *Acts,* 15:6-29.

sanction when it taught and legislated for the faithful of Jesus Christ. The members of the apostolic hierarchy, gathered together and ruling as a corporate unit at the Council of Jerusalem, were obviously and definitely conscious of the fact that they were divinely empowered to exercise their jurisdictional authority *conciliariter.*

Over the course of the centuries the Sovereign Pontiffs have had particular recourse to one scriptural text that goes to show why the apostolic college has from the very beginning considered the conciliar mode of operation definitely and legitimately connatural to it. It is Our Lord's statement: "For where there are two or three gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them."[3] It is most interesting to note that Pope Pius IX cited that text in his Bull, the *Aeterni Patris,* convoking the Vatican Council for assembly on Dec. 8, 1869.[4]

The theological theses taught in the scholastic *tractatus de conciliis oecumenicis* can be understood only in the light of the divinely revealed doctrine about the basic constitution of the Catholic Church, about St. Peter and his successors, and about the other members of the apostolic college. For, in this queen of the sciences, the ecumenical council definitely does not appear as the possessor of an authority over the universal Church in any way different or even distinct from that power of jurisdiction which Our Lord Himself conferred upon the original prince of the apostolic college and upon his successors. The ecumenical council exercises the fullness of jurisdiction over the entire Church militant of the New Testament. It acts as a unit, joined to and ruled over by the Sovereign Pontiff. Every member of this assembly who casts a decisive vote is participating in an act of authoritative teaching and legislation for the entire Church. But he is competent to perform such an act only when he utilizes a delegation from the Roman Pontiff, to whom alone, in St. Peter, Our Lord has given responsibility for and jurisdictional authority over the universal Church of God. As Billot shows so well, the same thing was true of the other apostles when they taught or legislated for the entire Church, as distinct

[3] *Matt.,* 18 : 20.

[4] Cf. *Acta et Decreta Sacrosancti Oecumenici Concilii Vaticani cum Permultis aliis Documentis ad Concilium ejusque Historiam Spectantibus,* auctoribus Presbyteris S.J. e Domo B.V.M. sine Labe Conceptae ad Lacum, col. 4.

from the individual local Churches over which they possessed ordinary power of jurisdiction.[5]

The scholastic theology of the ecumenical council thus takes into consideration all that the Church itself has defined and taught with reference to the nature and the competence of these assemblies. And, like every other section of theology, it brings out the meaning of these teachings by manifesting their origin and roots within the framework of the original deposit of divine public revelation. In this task it depends in a special way on the teachings of positive theology.

POSITIVE THEOLOGY

The particular part of the sacred science which is known as positive theology is primarily concerned with the literary sources upon which the theses of scholastic theology immediately depend. In the case of the ecumenical councils, the most immediately important among these literary sources are the texts of the records of the councils themselves. In a very special way, the scholastic theology of the ecumenical councils makes use of the inductive method. It explains the purpose and the nature of these assemblies in great measure from what the councils themselves have taught and ruled. And thus, for its own proper operation, it requires the most accurate and complete available records of the proceedings and the rulings of these assemblies.

There are some highly important councils which have left us no extant official records. Such, for example, is the first and perhaps the most important of all ecumenical councils, the first Nicea. In the case of this council, and in that of the almost innumerable particular councils which followed in its train, the actual teachings and rulings of these gatherings must be learned for the most part from an examination of other documents. The work of finding the true text and the true teachings of all the documents having to do with the nature, the authority, the doctrine, and the orders of an ecumenical council is definitely the business of positive theology.

[5] "Iurisdictio vero quam procul dubio [singuli praeter Petrum apostoli] praeter et ultra ordinarium particularium ecclesiarum episcopatum singulatim exercuerunt, in eis non fuit nisi ut in puris eiusdem Petri vicariis, cui soli monarchica Ecclesiae constitutio contulerat in proprium supremam atque universalem pascendi auctoritatem." Billot, *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi sive continuatio theologiae de Verbo Incarnato* (5th edition, Rome, 1927), I, 563.

Most valuable in this respect is the documentation on the Vatican Council given in the Continuation of Mansi's *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio* and in seventh volume of the *Collectio Lacensis*. Works of this type bring out, not only the actual constitutions, the decrees and the canons issued by the council, but also the various ways in which these constitutions appeared in their preparatory stages, while the council was still working on their text. Likewise they print the schemata which were being formulated by the different committees of the council, but which were never acted upon by the assembly as a whole. All of this is most valuable for an understanding of what the council itself actually taught.

On this point it is most important to remember that the only teachings actually issued by the Vatican Council, the only doctrines imposed upon the Church by the authority of the assembly, were those contained in the constitutions *Dei Filius* and *Pastor aeternus* and in the canons attached to these constitutions. The brilliantly written "First Draft of the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church of Christ," carried in the text of the very valuable handbook *The Church Teaches*,[6] is not in any sense an authoritative document of the *magisterium*. It is important, by reason of the fact that it is the fruit of the common efforts of some of the best theologians in the world at the time of the Vatican Council. But it definitely is not a body of teaching which the members of the true Church are obligated in conscience to accept with true and inward religious assent as a statement of the ecclesiastical *magisterium*. It is not peremptory and authoritative teaching, like the doctrine actually set forth by the ecumenical council, and confirmed and promulgated by the Sovereign Pontiff himself.

Similarly it must be understood that statements by individual Fathers of the Vatican Council recorded in the official Acta of the Council are by no means completely adequate and infallible norms for the interpretation of the constitutions of the Council, even when the individual Father speaks as the *Relator* for one of the deputations. This principle has been overlooked by some who, in our own time, pretended to find in the words of Bishop Conrad Martin of Paderborn, speaking to the Council in the name of the *Deputatio pro rebus fidei*, a reason to believe that the words "ordinario et universali magisterio" in the Council's teaching: "Porro fide divina

[6] Nn. 189-200.

et catholica ea omnia credenda sunt, quae in verbo Dei scripto vel tradito continentur et ab Ecclesia sive solemni iudicio sive ordinario et universali magisterio tanquam divinitus revelata credenda proponuntur,"[7] do not apply to the ordinary *magisterium* of the Roman Pontiff.

As a matter of fact the text of the *Acta* does not really support this contention. Furthermore, the common meaning of the terms employed in the conciliar teaching shows that this interpretation of Bishop Martin's remarks is not properly the work of positive theology at all.

The text originally submitted to the Fathers of the Council read as follows:

> Porro fide divina et catholica ea omnia credenda sunt, quae in verbo Dei scripto vel tradito continentur, et ab Ecclesia sive solemni iudicio sive ordinario magisterio credenda proponuntur.[8]

One of the Fathers of the Council proposed that the words "publico et universali" be inserted in the text to modify the term "magisterio." The *Deputatio pro rebus fidei* agreed to accept the word "universali." In his *relatio,* in the name of the Deputation, Bishop Martin offered this explanation.

> The reason why we would like to have the word "universali" joined to the word "magisterio" of our text is to prevent anyone from thinking that we are speaking here of the infallible *magisterium* of the Holy Apostolic See, distinguishing this infallible *magisterium* from the general councils. For I now have the honor of declaring to you from this pulpit that it has never been the intention of the Deputation either directly or indirectly to touch upon this question about the infallibility of the Sovereign Pontiff; and that therefore this word "universal" signifies about the same thing that the Holy Father meant in his use of the term in his apostolic letters, namely, the *magisterium* of the entire Church spread throughout the world.[9]

It seems quite clear that Bishop Martin was referring to the use of the expression "ordinary *magisterium*" by Pope Pius IX in his letter *Tuas libenter,* which was issued Dec. 21, 1863. This document contains the following sentence:

[7] *Denz.* 1792.
[8] *Acta et Decreta Sacrosancti Oecumenici Concilii Vaticani,* col. 73.
[9] *Ibid.,* col. 176.

Namque etiamsi ageretur de illa subjectione, quae fidei actu est praestanda, limitanda tamen non esset ad ea, quae expressis oecumenicorum Conciliorum aut Romanorum Pontificum huiusque Sedis decretis definita sunt, sed ad ea quoque extendenda, quae ordinario totius Ecclesiae per orbem dispersae magisterio tanquam divinitus revelata traduntur ideoque universali et constanti consensu a catholicis theologis ad fidem pertinere retinentur.[10]

The *Tuas libenter* stated that all Catholics are obliged in conscience to give an assent of divine faith, not only to the teachings defined as divinely revealed by the express or explicit decrees of the ecumenical councils and of the Roman Pontiffs, but also to those doctrines which are taught as divinely revealed by the ordinary *magisterium* of the entire Church spread throughout the world, and which, on that account, are accepted as pertaining to the faith by Catholic theologians with universal and constant agreement. There is nothing whatsoever in the terminology of this document which either states or implies that the *magisterium* it mentions must exclude the ordinary teaching activity of the Sovereign Pontiff. Actually the entire Church spread throughout the world is meant to be instructed on the content of the faith by the Roman Pontiff. The ordinary exercise of doctrinal jurisdiction by the Pope is an act of ecclesiastical *magisterium* that belongs to the universal Church spread throughout the world. When, in the course of his ordinary teaching activity, the Roman Pontiff using the fullness of his teaching authority proposes some truth to the entire Church as divinely revealed, the Catholic theologians of the world accept this teaching as *de fide* with universal and constant consent. The Holy Father's ordinary teaching activity or competence is of its very nature a *magisterium* which is at once ordinary and universal.

Such has always been the understanding of the Church's theologians. Thus the Cardinal John de Turrecremata, in his *Summa de ecclesia,* stresses a distinction between ecclesiastical councils which are called universal by reason of those who are summoned to attend it, or of those who actually take part in its deliberations, and those which are designated as universal "not by reason of those who are summoned, but by reason of the authority of the one who presides over it, which is so great that he can legislate and can issue commands for the entire *universitas* of the faithful."[11]

[10] *Denz.,* 1683. [11] Turrecremata, *Summa de ecclesia,* Lib. III, cap. 3.

In the same vein Francis Sylvius writes:

> We are not unaware of the fact that sometimes a council is called universal when it is not universal by reason of those who are invited to it, but only by reason of the authority of the one who presides over it, and of its subject matter, which concerns the universal Church [and thus it is universal] because it is called by the Roman Pontiff for affairs pertinent to the universal Church, even though the bishops of only one nation or country are called to it.[12]

Thus, on this point, we certainly can and should take the word of Bishop Martin to the effect that, in offering this particular statement in the dogmatic constitution *Dei Filius,* the members of the Vatican Council *Deputatio Pro rebus fide* did not intend to make any pronouncement or decision on the subject of papal infallibility. At the same time, however, we must likewise take cognizance of the fact that the ordinary teaching of the Sovereign Pontiff is in no way excluded from the "ordinary and universal *magisterium*" which is one of the ways in which the Church presents to its members the divinely revealed truths which they are obligated to accept with the assent of divine and Catholic faith. The late Pope Pius XII brought out this truth when he insisted, in the course of his encyclical *Humani generis,* that truths set forth in the papal encyclical letters are actually taught in the ordinary *magisterium,* "of which it is also true to say, 'he who hears you hears me.' "[13]

The positive theology of the councils is concerned, not only with the texts issued by these assemblies, but with all of the documents essentially connected with them. Thus, it is not from a text of the Vatican Council itself, but from that of the *Aeterni Patris,* the Papal Bull by which Pope Pius IX officially summoned the Vatican Council, that we find this statement relative to the essential purpose of the ecumenical council.

> Nor have the Pontiffs themselves neglected, where they considered it opportune, especially in times of most serious disturbances, and in times of calamity for our most holy religion and for civil society, to convoke general councils, in order that they might profit from the advice of and join forces with the Bishops of the entire Catholic world

---

[12] Sylvius, *De praecipuis fidei nostrae orthodoxae controversiis cum nostris haereticis,* Lib. V, art. 3.

[13] Cf. NCWC Translation, n. 20.

whom the Holy Ghost has placed to rule the Church of God, so as to decree providently and wisely on all that might be conducive especially to the definition of the dogmas of the faith, to the repudiation of prevalent errors, to the statement, the explanation, and the interpretation of Catholic doctrine, to watchfulness over and restoration of ecclesiastical discipline, and to the correction of corrupt morals among the people.[14]

Obviously the priests and the seminarians have very easy access to an excellent manual of positive theology in the latest edition of Denzinger's *Enchiridion symbolorum definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum.* It should contain far more texts than it actually carries, but it is reasonably adequate and perfectly accurate. It contains most of the material the priest would want about the doctrinal pronouncements of the ecumenical councils.

CANON LAW

The basic ecclesiastical legislation on the subject of ecumenical councils is to be found in the Code of Canon Law, cc. 222-29. The man who studies it must never lose sight of the fact that it is legislation. Sometimes, as in the case of c. 228, it enunciates divinely revealed truths. At other times, as in the case of c. 223, there is an exercise of the Church's supreme power of jurisdiction which is based upon the divine constitution of the Church. This canon enumerates those who are to be summoned to an ecumenical council and who are to have a deliberative vote in such an assembly. According to the Church's own divine constitution, only the residential bishops of the Catholic Church have an inherent right to be present and to exercise a deliberative vote in an ecumenical council. It remains true, however, that it lies within the province of the Sovereign Pontiff to invite others to take part in this assembly and to cast a deliberative vote in it. The Pope possesses this power by the very force and nature of his position in the Church militant of the New Testament.

Furthermore, in explaining c. 222, we must not lose sight of the fact that, in the commonly accepted list of the ecumenical councils, there are two which were in no way summoned or presided over by Roman Pontiffs. These two, the first and the second Councils of Constantinople, were subsequently given their listings

[14] *Acta et Decreta Sacrosancti Oecumenici Concilii Vaticani,* col. 2.

as ecumenical councils by the consent and the legislation of the Roman Church. The Roman Pontiff possesses and has exercised the power to take some of the decrees of a council which was particular rather than ecumenical in itself, and to give these decrees the status and the authority of rulings of an ecumenical council.

HISTORY

The *locus theologicus* constituted by the authority of the historians has an especially important function in the theological treatise on the ecumenical councils. Those who are interested in learning about the history of the individual councils will find excellent material in the pertinent articles of the *Catholic Encyclopedia*. The various councils are well treated, and there is a generally quite acceptable article on the councils in general by Doctor Wilhelm.

With the exception of a little book written more than two decades ago by Fr. Clement Raab, O.F.M.,[15] there is no generally available history of the ecumenical councils readily accessible in the English language. There are histories of individual councils, like Jedin's account of the Council of Trent,[16] now in course of translation into English, and Dom Cuthbert Butler's *The Vatican Council*.[17] Naturally, during this period of preparation for the forthcoming ecumenical council, more interest will be shown in the Vatican Council than in any of the previous councils of the universal Church. At this juncture it is certainly unfortunate that we do not have an English translation of the Granderath-Kirsch history of that assembly.

More clearly perhaps than any other literary source, the history of the councils shows the divine influence in the direction of the Catholic Church. Very frequently indeed there has been trouble and there has been contention surrounding the ecumenical councils, and sometimes within them. This was particularly true of the last of the ecumenical councils, the one held in the Vatican in 1869-70.

[15] Raab, *The Twenty Ecumenical Councils of the Catholic Church* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1937), pp. xiv + 226.

[16] Hubert Jedin, *A History of the Council of Trent*, translated from the German by Dom Ernest Graf. Volume I (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1957), pp. xi + 618.

[17] Butler, *The Vatican Council. The Story Told from Inside in Bishop Ullathorne's Letters* (New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1930). Volume I, pp. xix + 300. Volume II, pp. vii + 309.

Yet, basically undisturbed by all the turmoil and disagreement, the Church has proposed in these assemblies a limpidly clear and magnificently exact statement of God's supernatural revealed message. Out of these councils have come rulings which have been gloriously salutary to the entire Church.

The history of the ecumenical councils shows how these effects have been produced in times gone by. The prayer of the entire Catholic world will be concentrated, during the months that lie ahead, in a petition to God that these same singularly beneficent effects may be brought about by this new council announced by Pope John XXIII.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Answers to Questions

BLESSED THEOPHANE VÉNARD

Question: On what day is the feast of Blessed Theophane Vénard officially celebrated? At one time I was certain it was Feb. 2; now it seems to be Nov. 6. Will you please verify this for me?

Answer: The martyrdom of Blessed Theophane Vénard occurred in Tongking, Indo-China, on Feb. 2, 1861 but his feast, along with that of a number of other martyrs of Indo-China, is observed officially on Nov. 6 (Cf. Butler-Thurston-Attwater, *Lives of the Saints,* IV, 282 ff.). At The Venard, the high school department of the Maryknoll seminary, at Clark's Summit, Pa., the community still commemorates the day of martyrdom. Likewise, in Maryknoll houses, there is a novena invoking the intercession of Blessed Theophane which ends on the eve of Feb. 2.

BLESSING OF SAINT BLAISE

Question: For the blessing of throats on the feast of Saint Blaise is it sufficient to use candles blessed at Candlemas, or is a special blessing required?

Answer: The candles to be used for the blessing of throats on the feast of Saint Blaise or any other day should be specially blessed according to a formula which is found in the Roman Ritual (Ed. II, Amplificata I [1945], p. 382).

SIGN OF THE CROSS AFTER LEONINE PRAYERS

Question: Another priest and I serve each other at Mass every morning and I have noticed a difference in practice which I can't seem to resolve. Following the Leonine prayers he makes the sign of the Cross and I do not. Is there a rubric concerning this or is this practice optional?

Answer: Matters Liturgical, No. 243, *Note,* says: "A sign of the Cross at the end of the prayers after a low Mass is not prescribed. Nor is this to be recommended, since it is not according to the practice of the Church to terminate public exercises in this way."

VARIOUS RUBRICS OF THE MASS

Question 1: On arriving at the altar for a low Mass and on departing with the chalice after the recitation of the Leonine prayers, is it correct to bow to the tabernacle or cross?

Question 2: When are the eyes to be raised to the cross during Mass?

Question 3: What justification is there for kissing the altar to one side or the other of the chalice, a practice I have frequently observed?

Answer 1: There is no bow prescribed on arrival at the altar itself. The celebrant, of course, will have genuflected or made a profound bow at the foot of the altar steps, depending on whether or not the Blessed Sacrament is present in the tabernacle. Likewise, there is no bow prescribed in the *Ritus* when the celebrant picks up the chalice and turns to depart, although some rubricians have gratuitously added a bow here. Observation would seem to indicate that these rubricians have widespread influence but the *Ritus* still remains the official guide.

Answer 2: The eyes are raised to the cross (*ad Deum, ad caelum*) nine times during Mass:

(a) Before the *Munda cor meum*
(b) Before the *Suscipe, sancte Pater* of the Offertory
(c) Throughout the *Offerimus tibi* (*intentis ad Deum oculis*)
(d) At the words *Veni, sanctificator*
(e) Before *Suscipe, sancta Trinitas*
(f) At the words *Deo nostro* in *Gratias agamus Domino Deo nostro*
(g) As part of the action *before* the *Te igitur*
(h) At the words *elevatis oculis in caelum* at the Consecration of the host
(i) Before the last blessing as the priest begins *Benedicat vos*

Although this rubric is generally observed when it means suiting the action to the word, very many are careless about it before the *Munda cor meum* and the *Suscipe, sancta Trinitas.*

Answer 3: A few times in my life I have seen altars where the narrowness of the mensa and/or the size of the tabernacle make it practically impossible to kiss the altar without having the celebrant's head collide in unseemly fashion with the chalice or having his face brought dangerously near the Host, but most often the practice you have observed arises from bad habit, based at times on imaginary difficulties. At an altar with a generous mensa it makes no sense at all.

IS THE RADIO ROSARY INDULGENCED?

Question: Do those who recite the rosary by responding to the first part given over the radio gain the indulgences attached to the rosary?

Answer: The Sacred Penitentiary, under date of May 9, 1952, answered this question in the affirmative, provided that the radio recitation is "live." The indulgences are not gained, however, if the radio recitation is a prior recording on disks, wire, or other similar instruments.

BOWING AT THE DOXOLOGY

Question: Are those who chant the office or part of it in choir required to bow toward the altar when the last strophe of a hymn is sung?

Answer: A profound bow of the head (slightly involving the shoulders) is to be made toward the altar when the final strophe is a true doxology, i.e. when it contains a distinct mention of each Person of the Blessed Trinity together with *"glorificatio"* (an expression of honor, glory, praise, etc.). The bow is not to be made when the final stanza is a mere petition (e.g. *Praesta, Pater piissime*).

JOHN P. MCCORMICK, S.S.

THE CATHOLIC STAND ON EVOLUTION

Question: What is the correct Catholic stand on the evolution of man from a lower species of living creature? From conversation with some students from Catholic educational institutions (high

school and college) I have discovered that in some of their classes they hear it stated as an unquestionable fact that man has evolved from some lower form of animal life.

Answer: If the theory that man evolved from some lower form of living being is proposed by Catholic teachers as a demonstrated fact, these teachers are contradicting the principles laid down by Pope Pius XII in his Encyclical *Humani generis* (Aug. 12, 1950). After asserting that the human soul could not be evolved but can come into existence only through the direct creative activity of the Almighty, the Sovereign Pontiff clearly stated that the evolution of man's body has not been proved. At the same time, he added, Catholics may discuss and study this problem, weighing arguments on both sides, as long as they are prepared to accept any decision that the Church may issue on the subject. From this statement of the Pope we can reasonably conclude that Catholics can regard it as possible that at some future time the evolution of the human body may be conclusively demonstrated—which means that many centuries ago a species of animal life developed to a bodily resemblance of what is now the human body, and then God created spiritual souls for a male and a female, who then became the first parents of the human race. If this is proved, Catholics will accept it without compromising any doctrine of Catholic faith. But at present it is not scientifically proved; hence Catholics should consider the literal sense of Genesis, narrating the direct formation of the human body by the Creator, as the more acceptable explanation of man's origin. This attitude toward the doctrine of evolution is not only the teaching of the Catholic Church but is also the truly scientific attitude toward this theory. In view of these facts, the presentation of the theory of evolution as something that has been conclusively proved should not be tolerated in Catholic educational institutions, whether school, college or university.

HOLY COMMUNION TO THE SICK

Question: Is it in accordance with the spirit and the practice of the Church to bring Holy Communion daily to an aged person who does not seem to be in immediate danger of death but cannot leave the house?

Answer: Whatever the practice of priests may be in this matter, it is surely in full conformity with the spirit of the Church to bring such a person Holy Communion every day if he requests it. Of course, in a large parish it would be very difficult, if not impossible, for the priest to grant this favor to all sick persons who wish to receive the Holy Eucharist every day. But in a small parish where only a very few request daily communion (especially if they live near the church) a zealous priest should be able to fulfil their request. At least, he could bring them Holy Communion several times a week. And surely in a hospital with a resident chaplain all patients, even those not in danger of death, should be given Holy Communion daily if they ask this privilege.

A PASTOR'S POWER TO CONFIRM

Question: Is a pastor empowered to confirm validly one of his own parishioners who is in danger of death outside his own parish? In the event that he cannot confer the sacrament, is he suspended *ipso facto* if he attempts to do so?

Answer: It is evident from the decree *Spiritus Sancti munera,* issued by the Sacred Congregation on the Discipline of the Sacraments on Sept. 14, 1946, that pastors are empowered to confirm persons in danger of death *only within the limits of their respective parishes,* whether these persons are their parishioners or not. For the decree states that pastors "are able validly and licitly to confer Confirmation, when they themselves confer it personally on the faithful staying in their territory . . . provided that the faithful are in true danger of death from grave illness from which it is foreseen they will die" (n. 2). When a Catholic (who has not been confirmed) is in danger of death from grave illness outside his parish, the proper minister of Confirmation (presuming a bishop is not available) is the local pastor.

In case a pastor should attempt to administer Confirmation outside the limits of his parish, Canon 2365 is applicable, as the decree states (n. 2). The portion of this canon that is applicable to the present case says: "A priest who has not the faculty either by law or by grant from the Roman Pontiff and dares to administer the sacrament of Confirmation is to be suspended." It is to be noted

that this canon refers to one who *dares* (*ausus fuerit*) to attempt the function—a phraseology which indicates that any degree of ignorance, with the exception of "affected ignorance," will excuse him from the penalty (Can. 2229, § 2). We can hardly imagine any priest administering Confirmation with the full knowledge that it is invalid or deliberately choosing to remain ignorant on this point. Furthermore, it is to be noted that even though a priest would perform the ceremony of Confirmation with full knowledge that it is not valid, the penalty of suspension prescribed by the Code is not incurred *ipso facto* but is to be inflicted by a competent authority (*ferendae sententiae*).

A VIOLATION OF THE SEAL

Question: A priest who had just given a retreat in a certain Catholic school announced to some other priests that the confessions of the pupils were the worst he had ever heard. Was this a violation of the sacramental seal?

Answer: Yes. Any priest who would make such a statement would be guilty of an indirect violation of the sacramental seal—that is, a violation that would bring down suspicion and opprobrium on all the pupils, even though he did not name any one in particular. For his words would be equivalent to saying that the pupils commit many more sins than people realize. The smaller the school, the more serious would be the transgression of the priest. I believe that theologians would commonly hold that if the school was one of average size—having 500 or 600 pupils—a priest who would make so wide an accusation would be guilty of mortal sin. In the words of Fr. Merkelbach: "Even if the danger of suspecting certain persons in particular is excluded, there is an indirect violation, for there is suspicion of each one, or at least a lowering of esteem or infamy or shame redounds to the whole group, and hence to the penitents, in as far as they are members of the group" (Merkelbach, *Summa theologiae moralis,* III, n. 627). However, the priest would not incur an *ipso facto* penalty, because this is imposed only for a direct violation of the seal (Can. 2369, § 1).

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

Book Reviews

THE SACRIFICE OF PRAISE. By V. G. Little. New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons, 1958. Pp. 200. $3.00.

This volume has been written to help us better understand the history, mechanics, and prayers of the Roman breviary. To the beginner, it will be helpful, although frequently enough the author seems to minimize or fails to understand completely the difficulties encountered.

To the religious or priest obligated to and familiar with the breviary, this volume does offer help for a deeper appreciation of the formal, official prayer of the Church. The various hours and prayers are placed in their proper setting to give us their full meaning.

The growing number of laymen who are interested in the liturgical movement and the recitation of the breviary will find this handbook enlightening and beneficial, not so much from the standpoint of mechanics, but for a deeper and more comprehensive appreciation of the prayers, psalms and history.

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

INSIGHT: A STUDY OF HUMAN UNDERSTANDING. By Bernard J. F. Lonergan, S.J. New York: Philosophical Library, Second edition, 1958. Pp. xxx + 785. $10.00.

Father Lonergan once wrote approvingly of Dom Illtyd Trethowan's observation that it might make good sense if a philosopher said he was not a theologian, but that a theologian who says he is not a philosopher "is talking nonsense." Fr. Lonergan, dogmatic theologian at the Gregorian University in Rome, tackles quite explicitly in *Insight* a huge philosophical task. Professionally interested in theological inquiry, he has turned back to ask: what is *inquiry?*

For St. Thomas, understanding is grasp *per modum unius;* Father Lonergan has long been asking himself what, for St. Thomas, this organizing *unius* was. The vocabulary and the procedures of St. Thomas differ according to matter and occasion. Father Lonergan has been reaching for the single perspective that implicitly organized, for St. Thomas, these various approaches.

Since, however, modern idealists like Kant have likewise tried to be explicit on what is inquiry, and what is method, Father Lonergan in his reaching for St. Thomas may be taken at first glance as idealist in bent. His American reviewers (like James Collins, Germain Grisez, and Father Norris Clarke, S.J.), while usually high in praise, have likewise feared that he is too near to Kant, or essentialistic, or that he inverts the priority of being over knowing.

Strangely, reviews appearing in England have stressed much the opposite. (Cf. the laudatory references in *The Downside Review* or, near at hand, the notes on the jacket of the second edition, for example.) Father Lonergan's empiric bent, his closeness to modern physics, his almost "English" sense for fact have attracted favorable notice. Those who have noted references to Newman in his early work (in *Theological Studies* of the 1940's) are pleased too by what seems to be, in *Insight,* a grounding of Newman's Illative Sense in Father Lonergan's Virtually Unconditioned Judgment.

The very plan of *Insight* is on the side of the English reviewers. Father Lonergan devotes Part One to an inductive observation of insight in various areas of human knowing. What *is* insight? Then Part Two aims at the reader's affirming or denying the fact of this activity within his own consciousness. Do I or do I not experience this activity? Thus facts, not categories nor notions, control both halves of *Insight.*

What is insight? Initially and descriptively, it is "not any act of attention or advertence or memory but the supervening act of understanding. It is . . . the familiar event that occurs easily and frequently in the moderately intelligent, rarely and with difficulty only in the very stupid. . . . Its function . . . is so central that to grasp it in its conditions, its working, its results, is to confer a basic yet startling unity on the whole field of human inquiry and opinion" (p. ix). To understand how we understand is already to anticipate all that the human mind can do; it is to take a universal point of view, the fundamental position behind all positions.

Writing in a vigorous, imaginative style, Father Lonergan has achieved a powerfully argued, close-knit presentation of Aquinas to our contemporaries. Reading *Insight* is an intellectual discipline and joy. It is tough going. It will take a long time to digest.

The second edition embodies a small number of re-cast sentences and paragraphs, of which precise note is made in the preface.

MICHAEL NOVAK, C.S.C.

CHRISTIANITY AND AMERICAN FREEMASONRY. By William J. Whalen. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1958. Pp. xiii + 195. $3.75.

The present work develops the topic beyond mere presentation of statistics and description of practices. In this book Whalen subjects Masonry to what approximates a judicial examination. Certainly the case he draws up, principally involving the American version of the secret society, excels in judicial proprieties.

Whalen prosecutes the case for Christianity, not exclusively for the Catholic Church. In a well-documented position he maintains that other Christian bodies likewise oppose the clandestine Masonic organization. He claims "that the great majority of the world's Christians see the lodge as the cultic expression of naturalism and as such a rival to the Christian faith." (p. 162)

As prosecutor, he is direct and firm on principle; yet in method, always irenic. The opening line of the preface states the issue: "This book has been written to explain why the Church has warned her sons against affiliating with the Masonic lodge since 1738" (p. v). The next asserts the conclusion: "The Christian case against the lodge is conclusive." And the proof appears in the statements, exclamations, queries (rhetorical and real) which follow for more than 168 pages. All coalesce into one forceful exposure of Masonic errors and a serene defense of Christian truth in the spirit of St. Francis de Sales.

An appendix to the book is *Humanum genus,* Pope Leo XIII's encyclical on Freemasonry. It is as though Whalen were submitting his own work for official review. The inclusion of the encyclical is most appropriate, because in it the Pope stressed that the efforts of the hierarchy and clergy in unmasking the Masonic sect must be bolstered "by the industry of those among the laity in whom a love of religion and of country is joined to learning and goodness of life" (p. 182). The book, in its entirety, bespeaks these qualities in its author.

Proceeding from the conviction, "that a Christian cannot divide his allegiance between Jesus Christ and the Grand Architect of the Universe" (p. v), Whalen submits the evidence patiently and conscientiously. He sifts it. He scrutinizes it for the benefit of the reader, as if for a juror. Ever resourceful, he draws attention to its damning implications. After this strictly judicious treatment, he closes his case with a re-affirmation of the only logical theological position: "Not the Grand Architect of the Universe but God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit is our God. Not Hiram Abiff but Jesus Christ is our Saviour. Not by the mock death and resurrection rite of the Master

Mason's degree but by the sacrament of baptism do we become the children of God and heirs of heaven" (p. 168).

The evidence under consideration comes mainly from Masonic publications. In particular, Whalen relies upon the two acknowledged authorities in American Freemasonry, Albert Pike and Dr. Albert C. Mackey. He eschews rumors, hear-say, fables, etc., even warning against undiscerning and gullible credence in such tales (p. 106). Intent upon uncovering facts, Whalen leads the reader through Masonic ceremonies of initiation (Chapter III) by means of page after page of direct quotation from their published rituals. His explanation of the "higher degrees" (i.e. those beyond the basic three degrees comprising Blue Lodge membership) strips away misconceptions and clarifies the place of the Scottish and York rites in the Masonic structure. The Scottish rite culminates in the 32nd and 33rd degree membership, while the Knights Templar represent the acme for York rite members.

Utilizing simple logic, Whalen proves Freemasonry a religion, because it has its own doctrine (p. 77), its own ritual worship (p. 78), and its own moral code (p. 78). "In practically every respect Masonry resembles the mystery religions and as such represents not Christianity but a return to paganism" (p. 81).

Other objectionable features in Masonry do not escape his devastating analysis. He dissects the Masonic oaths, applies moral criteria to them, and makes note of the absence of conditions that justify extra-judicial oaths (p. 87).

A clever case-study of issues from *New Age,* publication of the Scottish rite, Southern Jurisdiction, illustrates the taunting, venomous anti-Catholicism of that body, although the local Blue lodges "generally adhere to the Masonic landmark which forbids discussion of religion and politics in the lodge" (p. 88).

For unwary Catholics who assume that the fraternal and social emphasis in American Freemasonry distinguishes it from the objectionable features of Latin and European Masonry, Mr. Whalen warns " . . . Their lodges (i.e. English and American) have been condemned for their religious naturalism not their atheism, for their immoral oaths, for their historic if technically unofficial anticlericalism" (p. 109).

Mr. Whalen's treatise deserves widespread circulation and serious reading. Factual, yet never dull because of the author's deft style and benign sallies, it serves both as an introduction to, and a reliable handbook of, Christianity's opposition to Freemasonry. Priests will find it a refreshing and fascinating account of the position they are called upon almost daily to defend. For readers in seminaries, universities,

colleges, and high schools, it can be held up as a model of modern apologetics. And one need not hesitate about introducing it to non-Catholics, be they neutrals, friends or foes. It is the right book with the ingredients well calculated to dispel all romantic notions about Masonic mysteries; and, a book with the power to proclaim the genuine mysteries revealed by God.

T. T. Mierzwinski

Look Out Below. By Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Francis L. Sampson, U.S.A. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1959. Pp. 234. $3.50.

Among the many legends emerging from those gallant soldiers known as paratroopers, none is more fascinating than that of a young priest of the Diocese of Des Moines, Father Francis Sampson. True, Father Sampson has aged a bit since he entered the service in 1942 but he gives no evidence of it in his eagerness to serve God and country. After experiencing the rigors of World War II, in which he was for six months a prisoner of war, he volunteered for service in Korea. At pesent he is Catholic chaplain of the VII Corps in Germany.

There are many gems of wisdom in this book, such as the following: "Combat was truly a perfect laboratory for a priest's study and work. There human nature was exposed for dissection and analysis. All the artificialities and superficialities of civilian life were cut away. There remained nothing but bedrock character, or, sometimes unfortunately, the almost total lack of character. Family position, social status, money, influence—these were mighty useless assets at the front." The author then stresses the discipline and religious training of the home as the basis for a good soldier.

Another interesting extract from Father Sampson's work is a sermon he gave to men in the process of separation. "Your enemy," he warned, "and God's is the Axis of the World, the flesh, and the devil: The world with all its tinsel and baubles, its false front, its sham and hypocrisy; the flesh with its poisoned delights, its insipid pleasures, its sensuality and insobriety; the devil with his hatred and greed, his envy, avarice, sloth, and, above all, pride. This is the enemy you are duty bound to fight." Soldiers understand that manner of speech.

There is humor and pathos in this intimate account of life with paratroopers. The final chapter, "The Commanders Speak," might

have been omitted. Not even the four-star generals can add or detract any from the record of our Airborne troops. Besides wearing the Gold Wings of a "century jumper," who has survived one hundred or more drops, Father Sampson has the Distinguished Service Cross, Bronze Star, Purple Heart, and at least three foreign decorations. Another paratrooper, Bishop Philip M. Hannan, wrote a preface. Cardinal Spellman wrote the Foreword. If more young priests had such a vision of priestly service as is portrayed in this book, Cardinal Spellman would not be so concerned about filling the Catholic quota of chaplains.

MAURICE S. SHEEHY

SAINTS AND OURSELVES. By Philip Caraman, S.J. (Editor). Second Series. New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons, 1956. Pp. 149. $3.00.

Father Philip Caraman, S.J., has edited a second collection of personal studies of the Saints, and in the opinion of this reviewer, it is a good job. The individual authors are all well-known writers; some primarily scholars, novelists, poets, scientists, men and women of many fields. Although the lives of the Saints are presented in a brief scholarly fashion, they are primarily written as appreciations. It is this reason, the subjective element, that makes this series such interesting spiritual reading. For the most part the authors abstract from what is non-essential in the life of the Saint, and concentrate on the central fact that made the person a Saint. Christopher Dawson does a masterful job on St. Boniface. The unique Joan of Arc is treated very well by Milton Waldman. Although everyone has his own preference in this regard, the reviewer especially liked F. Sherwood Taylor's perspective on St. Albert the Great, as well as Katharine Chorley's presentation of St. Peter Claver. The concise style of the authors also helps one to remember the essential facts about the Saint's life, and what in particular should be noted about the Saint.

Frequently the laity ask for a good book on the Saints, and sometimes it is a problem to recommend one in which they will not lose interest half-way through. Father Caraman has certainly answered that difficulty, and it is hoped that he will edit many more series on the Saints and Ourselves.

ERNEST MORT, C.S.P.

Don Bosco. By Lancelot C. Sheppard. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1957. Pp. viii + 196. One illustration. $3.50.

This is the life of a modern saint and miracle worker who served God as priest, founder, author, diplomat, and guide of youth.

Although the early education of the young man who quoted sermons, had special dreams, and entertained his friends with acrobatics and then led them in spiritual exercises, was full of family disputes, financial trials, and interruptions, when he did reach the major seminary he ranked highly and was especially known for his excellent memory.

After Ordination his friend, the now canonized Don Caffasso, advised him to add to his knowledge with practical training in pastoral methods and moral theology at the Convitto Ecclesiastico in Turin. While at Turin he decided to help the boys who were getting into trouble in the rapidly growing city. His known interest and practical help bore fruit and he soon had lines of youths outside his confessional. He started catechism classes for 300 boys and created his first Oratory. He was not applauded in the beginning, rather suspected for organizing a faction by some, and of lunacy by others. Besides his duties as chaplain at an orphanage, which he was later forced to drop, he gave lessons in Italian, French, and arithmetic to his boys. He saw visitors, visited prisons, preached special sermons, begged support for the boys, and wrote at nights. In all he is credited with some 130 publications.

Recovering from a serious illness he built two more Oratories and a new house and a church on the site of the first. Some boys took liberal education courses in town while others were trained in the technical shops at the Oratory. Because of Bosco's writings against the Waldensians they frequently attacked him, but he could find providential help in the form of a large dog which showed up to protect him.

Although early attempts in training a group with the idea of a congregation failed, by 1854 there was a small band of followers, and today there are over 18,000 Salesians. He also founded the Daughters of Mary, Help of Christians with Mary Mazzarello who was canonized in 1951, three years before another follower of Don Bosco, Dominic Savio.

Don Bosco took on foreign missions, having had a dream and a vision of the future work of the community in that field. Travelling through France raising funds for a church the Pope had asked him to finance, Bosco met crowds everywhere who came to see the man whose reputation for miracles and sanctity was widespread.

When Don Bosco died in 1888 at the age of 72 his Salesians were by then in Italy, France, Spain, and South America.

Of the three parts of this book the first two are the more intimate expositions of Don Bosco's personality and sanctity while the third section deals with him as founder. The author meticulously avoids declaring on his own authority that certain incidents were truly miraculous while at the same time doing justice to those which obviously were manifestations of the divine. Apart from an undue insistence on the difficulty of portraying the great number and diversity of Don Bosco's activities, the author has presented a very lucid and popular account which sets forth the instructive and edifying life of this great modern saint.

BERNARD A. FLOOD, C.S.P.

Books Received

THE JESUITS: A SELF-PORTRAIT. By Peter Lippert. Translated by John Murray. New York: Herder and Herder, 1958. Pp. 131. $2.25.

SERAPH AMONG ANGELS: THE LIFE OF ST. MARY MAGDALENE DE'PAZZI, CARMELITE AND MYSTIC. By Sister Mary Minima. Translated from the Italian and edited by the Very Rev. Gabriel N. Pausback, O.Carm. Chicago: The Carmelite Press, 1958. Pp. xviii + 363. $3.95.

APPROACH TO PRAYER. By Dom Hubert Van Zeller. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1959. Pp. xi + 129. $2.50.

THE SUFFERINGS AND GLORY OF JESUS. By James Brodrick, S.J. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Bookshop, 1958. Pp. 71. $1.25.

THE MYSTERY OF CALVARY. By Gerard Rooney, C.P. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1959. Pp. xi + 131. $3.50.

A HANDBOOK FOR HOSPITAL CHAPLAINS. By Patrick O'Brien, C.M. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1958. Pp. xiv + 362. $4.75.

TO THE OTHER TOWNS. A LIFE OF BLESSED PETER FAVRE, FIRST COMPANION OF ST. IGNATIUS. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1959. Pp. xi + 331. $4.50.

THE MASS AND THE ENGLISH REFORMERS. By C. W. Dugmore. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1958. Pp. xiv + 262. $8.50.

UNIVERSITATES STUDIORUM IN ECCLESIAE IURE ET IN CONCORDATIS VIGENTIBUS. By Ianuarius Laudiero. Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis. Pp. 100. No price given.

THE MASS: A LITURGICAL COMMENTARY. By A. Croegart. Vol. I. The Mass of the Catechumens. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1958. Pp. ix + 251. $4.75.

SCIENCE, RELIGION AND CHRISTIANITY. By Hans Urs von Balthasar. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1959. Pp. 155. $3.50.

MY FIRST SEVENTY YEARS. By Sister M. Madeleva, C.S.C. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1959. Pp. xii + 172. $3.50.

AUGUSTINE PHILOSOPHER OF FREEDOM: A STUDY IN COMPARATIVE PHILOSOPHY. By Mary T. Clark, R.S.C.J. New York: Desclée Company, 1958. Pp. 273. $4.50.

ARAMAIC GRAMMAR. (Method Gaspey-Otto-Sauer). Vol. I. By Rev. Thomas Arayathinal. Mannam, Kerala State, S. India: St. Joseph's Press, 1957. Pp. 461. No price given.

SAINT JEAN-MARIE VIANNEY: CURÉ OF ARS. By Margaret Trouncer. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1959. Pp. ix + 260. $3.95.

TOWARD OUR FATHER'S HOUSE. By A. S. Perret, O.P. Translated by R. N. Albright. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1958. Pp. 118. $2.50.

PRINCIPLES OF ETHICS. By Dom Thomas Verner Moore. Completely revised by Dom Gregory Stevens. Fifth edition. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1959. Pp. xiii + 282. $6.00.

RIGHT AND REASON. ETHICS IN THEORY AND PRACTICE. By Austin Fagothey, S.J. Second edition. St. Louis: The C. V. Mosby Co., 1959. Pp. 627. $6.00.

SIGNPOSTS TO PERFECTION. A selection from the Sermons of Johann Tauler. Selected, edited and translated by Elizabeth Strakosch. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1958. Pp. xxxix + 140. $3.75.